



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 46] नई दिल्ली, नवम्बर 12—नवम्बर 18, 2006, शनिवार/कार्तिक 21—कार्तिक 27, 1928
No. 46] NEW DELHI, NOVEMBER 12—NOVEMBER 18, 2006, SATURDAY/KARTIKA 21—KARTIKA 27, 1928

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृष्ठक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (II)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 3 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4387.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बिहार राज्य सरकार के गृह (आरक्षी) विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 1/सी.बी.आई.-80-21/2006 गृ.आ., 10837/पटना, दिनांक 27 सितंबर, 2006 द्वारा प्राप्त सहमति से पटना संग्रहालय, पटना से पाल-कालीन अमूल्य मूर्तियों की चोरी के संबंध में भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 457 और 380 के अधीन पुलिस स्टेशन, पटना कोतवाली में दर्ज मामला सं. 421/2006 दिनांक 26-09-2006 और उपर्युक्त अपराधों में से एक अथवा अधिक से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और षडयंत्र तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध अथवा अपराधों का अन्वेषण

3520 GI/2006

करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण बिहार राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/55/2006-ए.वी.डी.-II]

चंद्र प्रकाश, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES
AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel and Training)

New Delhi, the 3rd November, 2006

S. O. 4387.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of State Government of Bihar Home (Police) Department vide Notification No. 1/CBI 80-21/2006-HP(P)/10837 dated 27th September, 2006, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the member of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Bihar for

(9455)

investigation of Case No. 421/2006 dated 26-9-2006 registered at Police Station Patna Kotwali under Sections 457 and 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) relating to theft of invaluable Pal-era idols statues from the Patna Museum, Patna and attempts, abetments and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with one or more of the offences mentioned above and any other offence or offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/55/2006-AVD-II]

CHANDRA PRAKASH, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4388.—भारतीय निर्यात आयात बैंक (एक्विजि बैंक) अधिनियम, 1981 (1981 का 28) की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (1) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एन. रवि, सचिव (पूर्व) विदेश मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली को श्री रिनजिंग वांग्डी के स्थान पर भारतीय निर्यात-आयात बैंक के बोर्ड में निदेशक के रूप में नामित करती है।

[फा. सं. 24/1/2003-आई एफ-1]

एम. साहु, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 9th November, 2006

S.O. 4388.—In pursuance of Sub-clause (i) of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of Section 6 of Export-Import Bank of India Act, 1981 (28 of 1981), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri N. Ravi, Secretary (East), Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi as a Director on the Board of Export-Import Bank of India vice Shri Rinzing Wangdi.

[F. No. 24/1/2003-IF-1]

M. SAHU, Under Secy.

(राजस्व विभाग)

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2006

(आयकर)

का.आ. 4389.—जबकि आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) (यहां आगे उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 80 झ क

की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार ने 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2002 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये संख्या का.आ. 193(अ) दिनांक 30 मार्च, 1999 के ज़रिए तथा, 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2006 को समाप्त अवधि के लिए संख्या का.आ. 354 (अ), के ज़रिए भारत सरकार वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग) की अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की योजना निर्मित और अधिसूचित की है;

और, जबकि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लि. जिसका पंजीकृत कार्यालय उद्योग भवन, तिलक मार्ग, जयपुर-302005 में है, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र हनुमानगढ़ फेस-2 हनुमानगढ़, राजस्थान में एक औद्योगिक पार्क का विकास कर रहा है;

और जबकि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस अधिसूचना के अनुबंध में उल्लिखित नियम और शर्तों के अधीन वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्रालय के दिनांक 24-04-2006 के पत्र सं. 15/202/2005-आई पी एंड आई डी के अन्तर्गत उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क को अनुमोदित किया है;

इसलिए अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनार्थ औद्योगिक पार्क के रूप में मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर द्वारा विकसित तथा अनुरक्षित एवं प्रचालित किए जा रहे उक्त उपक्रम को अधिसूचित करती है।

अनुबंध

नियम एवं शर्तें जिन पर भारत सरकार ने मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की गठित किए जाने हेतु अनुमोदन प्रदान किया है।

1. (i) औद्योगिक उपक्रम का नाम : राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड
- (ii) प्रस्तावित स्थान : औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, हनुमानगढ़ फेस-2 हनुमानगढ़, राजस्थान
- (iii) औद्योगिक पार्क का क्षेत्रफल : 160.73 एकड़
- (iv) प्रस्तावित कार्यकलाप :

एन आई सी संहिता के साथ औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप का स्वरूप

एन आई सी संहिता					विवरण
क्रम सं.	अनुभाग	प्रभाग	समूह	श्रेणी	
क	2 और 3	—	—	—	विनिर्माण कार्यकलाप

(v) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित आबंटनीय क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत	: 98.68%
(vi) वाणिज्यिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत	: 0.76%
(vii) औद्योगिक यूनिटों की न्यूनतम संख्या	: 95 यूनिटें
(viii) प्रस्तावित कुल निवेश (राशि रुपए में)	: 282.84 लाख
(ix) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश (राशि रुपए में)	: शून्य
(x) अवसंरचनात्मक विकास पर निवेश जिसमें औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश भी शामिल है (राशि रुपए में)	: 202.65 लाख
(xi) औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने की प्रस्तावित तिथि	: 31-3-2006

2. किसी औद्योगिक पार्क में अवसंरचना विकास पर न्यूनतम निवेश कुल परियोजना लागत के 50% से कम नहीं होगा। ऐसे औद्योगिक पार्क जो औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थल प्रदान करता है, के मामले में औद्योगिक स्थल के निर्माण कार्य की लागत सहित विकास अवसंरचना पर न्यूनतम खर्च कुल परियोजना लागत के 60% से कम नहीं होगा।

3. संरचना विकास में सड़क (सम्पर्क सड़क सहित), जलापूर्ति तथा सीवरेंज, दूषित जल शोधन सुविधा, टेलिकॉम नेटवर्क, विद्युत उत्पादन एवं वितरण, वातानुकूलन तथा ऐसी अन्य सुविधाएं जो औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप हेतु सामान्य उपयोग के लिए हैं जो वाणिज्यिक दृष्टि से निर्धारणीय एवं प्रयुक्त हैं।

4. दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2002 की का.आ. 354(अ) के पैराग्राफ 6 के उप-पैराग्राफ (ख) में निर्दिष्ट तालिका के कॉलम (2) में उल्लिखित कोई एकल इकाई किसी औद्योगिक पार्क के लिए नियत औद्योगिक क्षेत्र का 50% से अधिक हिस्सा धारित नहीं करेगी। इस प्रयोजनार्थ किसी इकाई का आशय एक या एक से अधिक राज्य अथवा केन्द्रीय कर कानून के प्रयोजन के लिए किसी अलग तथा भिन्न कम्पनी से है।

5. आवश्यक अनुमोदनों, जिनमें विदेशी निवेश संवर्धन बोर्ड अथवा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अथवा उस समय प्रवृत्त किसी कानून के अन्तर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट किसी प्राधिकरण द्वारा विदेशी प्रत्यक्ष निवेश अथवा अनिवासी भारतीय निवेश के लिए अनुमोदन शामिल है, को प्रवृत्त नीति तथा प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार अलग से लिया जाएगा।

6. इस अधिसूचना के पैरा (1)(vii) में विनिर्दिष्ट संख्या में इकाइयों के औद्योगिक पार्क में अवस्थित होने के उपरान्त ही इस अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर लाभ प्राप्त हो सकते हैं।

7. मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर उस अवधि के दौरान औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन जारी रखेगा जिस अवधि में आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80ए झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) के अन्तर्गत लाभ लिए जाने हैं।

8. यदि उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने में इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1(xi) में निर्दिष्ट तिथि से एक वर्ष से ज्यादा विलम्ब होता है तो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा 4 (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त करने के लिए औद्योगिक पार्क योजना, 2002 के अन्तर्गत नया अनुमोदन प्राप्त करना अपेक्षित होगा।

9. यह अनुमोदन अवैध रहेगा और मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर ऐसी किसी प्रतिक्रिया की अवैधता के लिए स्वयं ही जिम्मेदार होगा, यदि :

(i) आवेदन पत्र जिसके आधार पर केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया है, में गलत सूचना/सूचना अथवा कतिपय तथ्यपरक सूचना न दी गई हो।

(ii) यह उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क की अवस्थिति हेतु है जिसके लिए अनुमोदन किसी अन्य उपक्रम के नाम में पहले ही प्रदान किया गया है।

10. यदि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर (अर्थात् अन्तरणकर्ता उपक्रम) औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन और अनुरक्षण किसी दूसरे उपक्रम (अर्थात् अंतरिती उपक्रम) को हस्तांतरित करेगा तो अंतरणकर्ता और अंतरिती उपर्युक्त हस्तांतरण के लिए अंतरणकर्ता और अंतरिती उपक्रम के बीच निष्पादित करार की प्रति के साथ औद्योगिक सहायता सचिवालय, औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11 की उद्यमशीलता सहायता यूनिट को संयुक्त रूप से सूचित करेंगे।

11. इस अधिसूचना में उल्लिखित शर्तों के साथ-साथ औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में शामिल उन शर्तों का अनुपालन उस अवधि के दौरान किया जाना चाहिए जिसके लिए इस स्कीम के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त किए जाने हैं। केन्द्र सरकार उपर्युक्त अनुमोदन को वापस ले सकती है यदि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में विहित शर्तों अथवा इस अधिसूचना की किसी भी शर्त के अनुपालन में असफल रहता है।

12. केन्द्र सरकार के अनुमोदन के बिना प्रोजेक्ट प्लान में किया गया कोई भी संशोधन अथवा भविष्य में पता लगना अथवा किसी ठोस तथ्य का उद्घाटन करने में आवेदक का असफल रहना, औद्योगिक पार्क के अनुमोदन को अवैध बना देना।

[अधिसूचना सं. 279/2006/फा. सं. 178/80/2006-आ.क.नि.-I]

दीपक गर्ग, अवर सचिव

(Department of Revenue)

(CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES)

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2006

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 4389.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), has framed and notified a scheme for Industrial Park, by the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion) *vide* number S.O. 193(E), dated the 30th March, 1999, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2002 and *vide* number S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st day of April, 2002, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2006;

And whereas M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, having registered office at Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur- 302005 is developing an Industrial Park, at Industrial Area Hanumangarh, Phase 2nd, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan;

And whereas the Central Government has approved the said Industrial Park *vide* Ministry of Commerce and Industry letter No. 15/2002/2005-IP & ID dated 24-4-2006

subject to the terms and conditions mentioned in the annexure to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the said Act, the Central Government hereby notifies the undertaking, being developed and being maintained and operated by M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, as an Industrial Park for the purposes of the said clause (iii).

ANNEXURE

The terms and conditions on which the approval of the Government of India has been accorded for setting up of an Industrial Park by M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur.

1. (i) Name of the Industrial Undertaking : Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur.
- (ii) Proposed location : Industrial Area Hanumangarh, Phase 2nd, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.
- (iii) Area of Industrial Park : 160.73 Acres.
- (iv) Proposed activities

Nature of Industrial activity with NIC Code

S.No.	NIC Code				Description
	Section	Division	Group	Class	
A	2 & 3	—	—	—	Manufacturing
(v)	Percentage of allocable area earmarked for industrial use	:	98.68%		
(vi)	Percentage of allocable area earmarked for commercial use	:	0.76%		
(vii)	Minimum number of industrial units	:	95 Units		
(viii)	Total investments proposed (Amount in Rupees)	:	Rs. 282.84 lakhs		
(ix)	Investment on built-up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees)	:	Nil		
(x)	Investment on Infrastructure Development including investment on built-up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees)	:	Rs. 202.65 lakhs		
(xi)	Proposed date of Commencement of the Industrial Park	:	31-3-2006		

2. The minimum investment on infrastructure development in an Industrial Park shall not be less than 50% of the total project cost. In the case of an Industrial Park which provides built-up space for industrial use, the minimum expenditure on infrastructure development including cost of construction of industrial space, shall not be less than 60% of the total project cost.

3. Infrastructure development shall include, roads (including approach roads), water supply and sewerage, common effluent treatment facility, telecom network, generation and distribution of power, air-conditioning and such other facilities as are for common use for industrial activity which are identifiable and are provided on commercial terms.

4. No single unit referred to in column (2) of the Table given in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 6 of S. O. 354 (E), dated the 1st April, 2002, shall occupy more than fifty per cent of the allocable industrial area of an Industrial Park. For this purpose a unit means any separate and distinct entity for the purpose of one and more State or Central tax laws.

5. Necessary approvals, including that for foreign direct investment or non-resident Indian investment by the Foreign Investment Promotion Board or Reserve Bank of India or any authority specified under any law for the time being in force, shall be taken separately as per the policy and procedures in force.

6. The tax benefits under the Act can be availed of only after the number of units indicated in Para 1(vii) of this Notification, are located in the Industrial Park.

7. M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur shall continue to operate the Industrial Park during the period in which the benefits under clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 are to be availed.

8. In case the commencement of the Industrial Park is delayed by more than one year from the date indicated in Para 1(xi) of this notification, fresh approval will be required under the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002, for availing benefits under sub-section 4(iii) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

9. The approval will be invalid and M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur shall be solely responsible for any repercussions of such invalidity, if

- (i) the application on the basis of which the approval is accorded by the Central Government contains wrong information/misinformation or some material information has not been provided in it.
- (ii) it is for the location of the Industrial Park for which approval has already been accorded in the name of another undertaking.

10. In case M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur transfers the operation and maintenance of the Industrial Park (i.e., transferor undertaking) to another undertaking (i.e., the transferee undertaking), the transferor and transferee shall jointly intimate to the Entrepreneurial Assistance Unit of the Secretariat for Industrial Assistance, Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-11 along with a copy of the agreement executed between the transferor and transferee undertaking for the aforesaid transfer.

11. The conditions mentioned in this notification as well as those included in the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002 should be adhered to during the period for which benefits under this scheme are to be availed. The Central Government may withdraw the above approval in case M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, fails to comply with any of the conditions.

12. Any amendment of the project plan without the approval of the Central Government or detection in

future, or failure on the part of the applicant to disclose any material fact, will invalidate the approval of the Industrial Park.

[Notification No. 279/2006/F. No. 178/80/2006-ITA-I]

DEEPAK GARG, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2006

(आयकर)

का.आ. 4390.—जबकि आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) (यहां आगे उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 80 झ क की उपधारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार ने 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2002 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये संख्या का.आ. 193(अ) दिनांक 30 मार्च, 1999 के ज़रिए तथा 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2006 को समाप्त अवधि के लिए संख्या का.आ. 354(अ), के ज़रिए भारत सरकार वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग) की अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की योजना निर्मित और अधिसूचित की है ;

और जबकि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड जिसका पंजीकृत कार्यालय उद्योग भवन, तिलक मार्ग, जयपुर-302005 में है, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र भवानी मंडी, झालावाड़, राजस्थान-326001 में एक औद्योगिक पार्क का विकास कर रहा है;

और जबकि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस अधिसूचना के अनुबंध में उल्लिखित नियम और शर्तों के अधीन वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्रालय के दिनांक 11-05-2006 के पत्र सं. 15/103/2005-आई पी एंड आई डी के अन्तर्गत उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क अनुमोदित किया है;

इसलिए अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनार्थ औद्योगिक पार्क के रूप में मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर द्वारा विकसित तथा अनुरक्षित एवं प्रचालित किए जा रहे उक्त उपक्रम को अधिसूचित करती है ।

अनुबंध

नियम एवं शर्तें जिन पर भारत सरकार ने मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की गठित किए जाने हेतु अनुमोदन प्रदान किया है ।

1. (i) औद्योगिक उपक्रम का नाम : राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड,
- (ii) प्रस्तावित स्थान : औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, भवानी मंडी, झालावाड़, राजस्थान-326 001
- (iii) औद्योगिक पार्क का क्षेत्रफल : 49.19 एकड़

(iv) प्रस्तावित कार्यकलाप :

**एन आई सी संहिता के साथ औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप
का स्वरूप**

एन आई सी संहिता					विवरण
क्रम सं.	अनुभाग	प्रभाग	समूह	श्रेणी	
क	2 और 3	—	—	—	विनिर्माण कार्यकलाप
(v)	औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित आबंटनीय क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत	: 96.9%			प्रयोजनार्थ किसी इकाई का आशय एक या एक से अधिक राज्य अथवा केन्द्रीय कर कानून के प्रयोजन के लिए किसी अलग तथा भिन्न कम्पनी से है।
(vi)	वाणिज्यिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत	: 3.0%			5. आवश्यक अनुमोदनों, जिनमें विदेशी निवेश संवर्धन बोर्ड अथवा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अथवा उस समय प्रवृत्त किसी कानून के अन्तर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट किसी प्राधिकरण द्वारा विदेशी प्रत्यक्ष निवेश अथवा अनिवासी भारतीय निवेश के लिए अनुमोदन शामिल है, को प्रवृत्त नीति तथा प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार अलग से लिया जाएगा।
(vii)	औद्योगिक यूनिटों की न्यूनतम संख्या	: 155 यूनिटें			6. इस अधिसूचना के पैरा (1)(vii) में विनिर्दिष्ट संख्या में इकाइयों के औद्योगिक पार्क में अवस्थित होने के उपरान्त ही इस अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर लाभ प्राप्त हो सकते हैं।
(viii)	प्रस्तावित कुल निवेश (राशि रुपए में)	: 61.89 लाख			7. मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर उस अवधि के दौरान औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन जारी रखेगा जिस अवधि में आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) के अन्तर्गत लाभ लिए जाने हैं।
(ix)	औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश (राशि रुपए में)	: शून्य			8. यदि उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने में इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1(xi) में निर्दिष्ट तिथि से एक वर्ष से ज्यादा विलम्ब होता है तो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80 झ क की उपधारा 4 (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त करने के लिए औद्योगिक पार्क योजना, 2002 के अन्तर्गत नया अनुमोदन प्राप्त करना अपेक्षित होगा।
(x)	अवसंरचनात्मक विकास पर निवेश जिसमें औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश भी शामिल है (राशि रुपए में)	: 59.40 लाख			9. यह अनुमोदन अवैध रहेगा और मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर ऐसी अवैधता के प्रणामों के लिए स्वयं ही जिम्मेदार होगा, यदि
(xi)	औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने की तिथि	: 31-3-2006			(i) आवेदन पत्र जिसके आधार पर केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया है, में गलत सूचना/ सूचना अथवा कतिपय तथ्यपरक सूचना न दी गई हो।
					(ii) यह उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क की अवस्थिति हेतु है जिसके लिए अनुमोदन किसी अन्य उपक्रम के नाम में पहले ही प्रदान किया गया है।
					10. यदि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर (अर्थात् अन्तरणकर्ता उपक्रम) औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन और अनुरक्षण किसी दूसरे उपक्रम (अर्थात् अंतर्गती उपक्रम) को हस्तांतरित करेगा तो अंतरणकर्ता और अंतर्गती उपर्युक्त हस्तांतरण के लिए अंतरणकर्ता और अंतर्गती उपक्रम

2. किसी औद्योगिक पार्क में अवसंरचना विकास पर न्यूनतम निवेश कुल परियोजना लागत के 50% से कम नहीं होगा। ऐसे औद्योगिक पार्क जो औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थल प्रदान करता है, के मामले में औद्योगिक स्थल के निर्माण कार्य की लागत सहित विकास अवसंरचना पर न्यूनतम खर्च कुल परियोजना लागत के 60% से कम नहीं होगा।

3. संरचना विकास में सड़क (सम्पर्क सड़क सहित), जलापूर्ति तथा सीवरेज, दूषित जल शोधन सुविधा, टेलिकॉम नेटवर्क, विद्युत उत्पादन एवं वितरण, वातानुकूलन तथा ऐसी अन्य सुविधाएं जो औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप हेतु सामान्य उपयोग के लिए हैं जो वाणिज्यिक दृष्टि से निर्धारणीय एवं प्रयुक्त हैं।

4. दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2002 की का.आ. 354(अ) के पैराग्राफ 6 के उप-पैराग्राफ (ख) में निर्दिष्ट तालिका के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित कोई एकल इकाई किसी औद्योगिक पार्क के लिए नियत औद्योगिक क्षेत्र का 50% से अधिक हिस्सा धारित नहीं करेगी। इस

के बीच निष्पादित करार की प्रति के साथ औद्योगिक सहायता सचिवालय, औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11 की उद्यमशीलता सहायता यूनिट को संयुक्त रूप से सूचित करेंगे।

11. इस अधिसूचना में उल्लिखित शर्तों के साथ-साथ औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में शामिल उन शर्तों का अनुपालन उस अवधि के दौरान किया जाना चाहिए जिसके लिए इस स्कीम के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त किए जाने हैं। केन्द्र सरकार उपर्युक्त अनुमोदन को वापस ले सकती है यदि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एंड इन्वेस्टमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन लि., जयपुर औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में विहित शर्तों अथवा इस अधिसूचना की किसी भी शर्त के अनुपालन में असफल रहता है।

12. केन्द्र सरकार के अनुमोदन के बिना प्रोजेक्ट प्लान में किया गया कोई भी संशोधन अथवा भविष्य में पता लगना अथवा किसी ठोस तथ्य का उद्घाटन करने में आवेदक का असफल रहना, औद्योगिक पार्क के अनुमोदन को अवैध बना देगा।

[अधिसूचना सं. 280/2006/फा. सं. 178/78/2006-आ.क.नि.-I]

दीपक गर्ग, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2006

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 4390.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of Sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), has framed and notified a scheme for Industrial Park, by the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion) vide number S.O. 193(E), dated the 30th March, 1999, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2002 and vide number S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st day of April, 2002, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2006;

Nature of Industrial activity with NIC Code

S. No.	NIC Code			Description
	Section	Division	Group	
A	2 and 3	—	—	Manufacturing
(v)	Percentage of allocable area earmarked for industrial use	:	96.9%	(x) Investment on Infrastructure Development including investment on built up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees)
(vi)	Percentage of allocable area earmarked for commercial use	:	3.0%	(xi) Proposed date of Commencement of the Industrial Park
(vii)	Minimum number of industrial units	:	155 Units	
(viii)	Total investments proposed (Amount in Rupees)	:	61.89 lakhs	
(ix)	Investment on built up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees)	:	Nil	

And whereas M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, having registered office at Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur- 302005 is developing an Industrial Park, at Industrial Area Bhawani Mandi, Jhalawar, Rajasthan-326 001;

And whereas the Central Government has approved the said Industrial Park vide Ministry of Commerce and Industry letter No. 15/103/2005-IP & ID dated 11-5-2006 subject to the terms and conditions mentioned in the annexure to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of Sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the said Act, the Central Government hereby notifies the undertaking, being developed and being maintained and operated by M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, as an Industrial Park for the purposes of the said clause (iii).

ANNEXURE

The terms and conditions on which the approval of the Government of India has been accorded for setting up of an industrial park by M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur.

1. (i) Name of the Industrial Undertaking : Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited.
- (ii) Proposed location : Industrial Area Bhawani Mandi, Jhalawar, Rajasthan-326 001
- (iii) Area of Industrial Park : 49.19 acres.
- (iv) Proposed activities

2. The minimum investment on infrastructure development in an Industrial Park shall not be less than

50% of the total project cost. In the case of an Industrial Park which provides built-up space for industrial use, the minimum expenditure on infrastructure development including cost of construction of industrial space, shall not be less than 60% of the total project cost.

3. Infrastructure development shall include, roads (including approach roads), water supply and sewerage, common effluent treatment facility, telecom network, generation and distribution of power, air-conditioning and such other facilities as are for common use for industrial activity which are identifiable and are provided on commercial terms.

4. No single unit referred to in column (2) of the Table given in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 6 of S.O. 354(E), dated the 1st April, 2002, shall occupy more than fifty per cent of the allocable industrial area of an Industrial Park. For this purpose a unit means any separate and distinct entity for the purpose of one and more State or Central tax laws.

5. Necessary approvals, including that for foreign direct investment or non-resident Indian investment by the Foreign Investment Promotion Board or Reserve Bank of India or any authority specified under any law for the time being in force, shall be taken separately as per the policy and procedures in force.

6. The tax benefits under the Act can be availed of only after the number of units indicated in Para 1(vii) of this Notification, are located in the Industrial Park.

7. M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur shall continue to operate the Industrial Park during the period in which the benefits under clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 are to be availed.

8. In case the commencement of the Industrial Park is delayed by more than one year from the date indicated in Para 1(xi) of this notification, fresh approval will be required under the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002, for availing benefits under sub-section 4(iii) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

9. The approval will be invalid and M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur shall be solely responsible for any repercussions of such invalidity, if

- (i) the application on the basis of which the approval is accorded by the Central Government contains wrong information/misinformation or some material information has not been provided in it.
- (ii) it is for the location of the Industrial Park for which approval has already been accorded in the name of another undertaking.

10. In case M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur

transfers the operation and maintenance of the Industrial Park (i.e., transferor undertaking) to another undertaking (i.e., the transferee undertaking), the transferor and transferee shall jointly intimate to the Entrepreneurial Assistance Unit of the Secretariat for Industrial Assistance, Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-11 alongwith a copy of the agreement executed between the transferor and transferee undertaking for the aforesaid transfer.

11. The conditions mentioned in this notification as well as those included in the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002 should be adhered to during the period for which benefits under this scheme are to be availed. The Central Government may withdraw the above approval in case M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur fails to comply with any of the conditions.

12. Any amendment of the project plan without the approval of the Central Government or detection in future, or failure on the part of the applicant to disclose any material fact, will invalidate the approval of the Industrial Park.

[Notification No. 280/2006/F. No. 178/78/2006-ITA-I]

DEEPAK GARG, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2006

(आयकर)

का.आ. 4391.—जबकि आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) (यहां आगे उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार ने 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2002 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये संख्या का.आ. 193(अ) दिनांक 30 मार्च, 1999 के ज़रिए तथा, 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2006 को समाप्त अवधि के लिए संख्या का.आ. 354(अ), दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2002 के ज़रिए भारत सरकार, वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग) की अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की योजना निर्मित और अधिसूचित की है ;

और जबकि मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, जिसका पंजीकृत कार्यालय 9बी, वुड स्ट्रीट, तृतीय तल, कोलकाता-700 016 में है, प्लॉट नं. 3, ई पी आई पी, हवाईटफील्ड, बंगलौर में एक औद्योगिक पार्क का विकास कर रहा है;

और जबकि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस अधिसूचना के अनुबंध में उल्लिखित नियम और शर्तों के अधीन वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्रालय के दिनांक 13-05-2005 के पत्र सं. 15-6-2005-आई पी एंड आई डी (वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय द्वारा 25-05-2005 को संशोधित) के अन्तर्गत उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क अनुमोदित किया है;

इसलिए अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 80 झक की उपधारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र

सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनार्थ औद्योगिक पार्क के रूप में मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, कोलकाता द्वारा विकसित तथा अनुरक्षित एवं प्रचालित किए जा रहे उक्त उपक्रम को अधिसूचित करती है।

अनुबंध

नियम एवं शर्तें जिन पर भारत सरकार ने मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, कोलकाता द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क गठित किए जाने हेतु अनुमोदन प्रदान किया है।

1. (i) औद्योगिक उपक्रम का नाम : बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड
- (ii) प्रस्तावित स्थान : प्लॉट नं. 3, ईपीआई पी, हवाईमार्ग, बंगलौर
- (iii) औद्योगिक पार्क का कुल क्षेत्रफल : 48,957 वर्ग मीटर
- (iv) प्रस्तावित कार्यकलाप :

एन आई सी संहिता के साथ औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप का स्वरूप

एन आई सी संहिता					विवरण
क्रम सं.	अनुभाग	प्रभाग	समूह	श्रेणी	
क	2 और 3	—	—	—	निर्माण
ख	4	—	—	—	विजली, गैस और पानी
ग	7	75	—	—	संचार सेवाएं
घ	8	89	892	—	डाटा प्रोसेसिंग साफ्टवेयर डेवलपमेंट एंड कंप्यूटर कन्सल्टेन्सी सर्विसिज।
ङ	8	89	893	—	बिजनेस और मैनेजमेंट कन्सल्टेन्सी एक्टिविटीज
च	8	89	894	—	वास्तुशिल्पीय और इंजिनियरिंग तथा अन्य तकनीकी परामर्शी कार्य
छ	8	89	895	—	टेक्नीकल टेस्टिंग एंड एनालाइसिस सर्विसिज

- (v) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित आर्बटनीय क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत : 90.01%
- (vi) वाणिज्यिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत : 9.99%
- (vii) औद्योगिक यूनिटों की न्यूनतम संख्या : 7 यूनिटें
- (viii) प्रस्तावित कुल निवेश (राशि रुपए में) : 532,380,068
- (ix) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश (राशि रुपए में) : 391,487,715
- (x) अवसंरचनात्मक विकास पर निवेश जिसमें औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश भी शामिल है (राशि रुपए में) : 457,824,015
- (xi) औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने की प्रस्तावित तिथि : 30-11-2005

2. किसी औद्योगिक पार्क में अवसंरचना विकास पर न्यूनतम निवेश कुल परियोजना लागत के 50% से कम नहीं होगा। ऐसे औद्योगिक पार्क जो औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थल प्रदान करता है, के मामले में औद्योगिक स्थल के निर्माण कार्य की लागत सहित विकास अवसंरचना पर न्यूनतम खर्च कुल परियोजना लागत के 60% से कम नहीं होगा।

3. संरचना विकास में सड़क (सम्पर्क सड़क सहित), जलापूर्ति तथा सीवरेंज, वृक्षित जल स्रोतों सुविधा, टेलिकॉम नेटवर्क, विद्युत उत्पादन एवं वितरण, वातानुकूलन तथा ऐसी अन्य सुविधाएं जो औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप हेतु सामान्य उपयोग के लिए हैं जो वाणिज्यिक दृष्टि से निर्धारणीय एवं प्रयुक्त हैं।

4. दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2002 की का.आ. 354(अ) के पैराग्राफ 6 के उप-पैराग्राफ (ख) में निर्दिष्ट कालिका के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित कोई एकल इकाई किसी औद्योगिक पार्क के लिए नियत औद्योगिक क्षेत्र का 50% से अधिक हिस्सा धारित नहीं करेगी। इस प्रयोजनार्थ किसी इकाई का आकार एक या एक से अधिक राज्य अथवा केन्द्रीय कर कानून के प्रयोजन के लिए किसी अलग तथा भिन्न कम्पनी से है।

5. आवश्यक अनुमोदनों, जिनमें विदेशी निवेश संवर्धन बोर्ड अथवा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अथवा उस समय प्रवृत्त किसी कानून के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट किसी प्राधिकरण द्वारा विदेशी प्रत्यक्ष निवेश अथवा अनिवासी भारतीय निवेश के लिए अनुमोदन शामिल है, को प्रवृत्त नीति तथा प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार अलग से लिया जाएगा।

6. इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1 (vii) में विनिर्दिष्ट संख्या में इकाइयों के औद्योगिक पार्क में अवस्थित होने के उपरान्त ही इस अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर लाभ प्राप्त हो सकते हैं।

7. मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, उस अवधि के दौरान औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन जारी रखेगा जिस अवधि में आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) के अन्तर्गत लाभ लिए जाने हैं।

8. यदि उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने में इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1 (xi) में निर्दिष्ट तिथि से एक वर्ष से ज्यादा विलम्ब होता है तो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा 4 (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त करने के लिए औद्योगिक पार्क योजना, 2002 के अंतर्गत नया अनुमोदन प्राप्त करना अपेक्षित होगा।

9. यह अनुमोदन अवैध रहेगा और मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, ऐसी अवैधता के परिणामों के लिए स्वयं ही जिम्मेदार होगा, यदि—

- (i) आवेदन पत्र जिसके आधार पर केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया है, में गलत सूचना/सूचना अथवा कतिपय तथ्यपरक सूचना न दी गई हो।
- (ii) यह उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क की अवस्थिति हेतु है जिसके लिए अनुमोदन किसी अन्य उपक्रम के नाम में पहले ही प्रदान किया गया है।

10. यदि मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड (अर्थात् अन्तर्करणकर्ता उपक्रम) औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन और अनुरक्षण किसी दूसरे उपक्रम (अर्थात् अंतर्गती उपक्रम) को हस्तांतरित करेगा तो अंतरणकर्ता और अंतर्गती उपर्युक्त हस्तांतरण के लिए अंतरणकर्ता और अंतर्गती उपक्रम के बीच निष्पादित करार की प्रति के साथ औद्योगिक सहायता सचिवालय, औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11 की उद्यमशीलता सहायता यूनिट को संयुक्त रूप से सूचित करेंगे।

11. इस अधिसूचना में उल्लिखित शर्तों के साथ-साथ औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में शामिल उन शर्तों का अनुपालन उस अवधि के दौरान किया जाना चाहिए जिसके लिए इस स्कीम के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त किए जाने हैं। केन्द्र सरकार उपर्युक्त अनुमोदन को वापस ले सकती है यदि मैसर्स बी आई पी डवलपर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में विहित शर्तों अथवा इस अधिसूचना की किसी भी शर्त के अनुपालन में असफल रहता है।

12. केन्द्र सरकार के अनुमोदन के बिना प्रोजेक्ट प्लान में किया गया कोई भी संशोधन अथवा भविष्य में पता लगना अथवा

किसी ठोस तथ्य का उद्घाटन करने में आवेदक का असफल रहना, औद्योगिक पार्क के अनुमोदन को अवैध बना देगा।

[अधिसूचना सं. 281/2006/फा. सं. 178/63/2005-आ.क.नि.-1]

दीपक गर्ग, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2006

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 4391.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section(4) of Section 80-1A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), has framed and notified a scheme for industrial park, by the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion) vide number S.O. 193(E), dated the 30th March, 1999, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2002 and vide number S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st day of April, 2002, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2006;

And whereas M/s. BIP Developers Private Limited, having registered office at 9B, Wood Street, 3rd Floor, Kolkata-700 016, is developing an Industrial Park at Plot No. 3, EPIP, Whitefield, Bangalore;

And whereas the Central Government has approved the said Industrial Park vide Ministry of Commerce and Industry, letter No. 15/6/05-IP&ID dated 13-05-2005 (corrected by Ministry of Commerce and Industry on 25-05-2005) subject to the terms and conditions mentioned in the annexure to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-1A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby notifies the undertaking being developed and being maintained and operated by M/s. BIP Developers Private Limited, Kolkata, as an industrial park for the purposes of the said clause (iii).

ANNEXURE

The terms and conditions on which the approval of the Government of India has been accorded for setting up of an industrial park by M/s. BIP Developers Private Limited, Kolkata:

1. (i) Name of the Industrial Undertaking : BIP Developers Private Limited.
- (ii) Proposed location : Plot No. 3, EPIP, Whitefield, Bangalore.
- (iii) Total area of Industrial Park : 48,957 Square Meters.
- (iv) Proposed activities

Nature of Industrial activity with NIC code					
NIC Code				Description	
S. No.	Section	Division	Group	Class	
A	2 and 3	—	—	—	Manufacturing
B	4	—	—	—	Electricity, Gas and Water
C	7	75	—	—	Communication Services
D	8	89	892	—	Data Processing, Software Development and Computer consultancy services
E	8	89	893	—	Business and management consultancy activities
F	8	89	894	—	Architectural and engineering and other technical consultancy activities
G	8	89	895	—	Technical testing and analysis services

(v) Percentage of allocable area earmarked for industrial use : 90.01%

(vi) Percentage of allocable area earmarked for commercial use. : 9.99%

(vii) Minimum number of industrial units : 7 Units

(viii) Total investments proposed (Amount in Rupees). : 532,380,068

(ix) Investment on built up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees). : 391,487,715

(x) Investment on Infrastructure Development including investment on built up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees). : 457,824,015

(xi) Proposed date of commencement of the Industrial Park : 30-11-2005

- The minimum investment of infrastructure development in an Industrial Park shall not be less than 50% of the total project cost. In the case of an Industrial Park which provides built-up space for industrial use, the minimum expenditure on infrastructure development including cost of construction of industrial space, shall not be less than 60% of the total project cost.
- Infrastructure development shall include, roads (including approach roads), water supply and sewerage, common effluent treatment facility, telecom network, generation and distribution of power, air-conditioning and such other facilities as are for common use for industrial activity which are identifiable and are provided on commercial terms.
- No single unit referred to in column (2) of the Table given in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 6 of S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st April, 2002, shall occupy more than fifty per cent of the allocable industrial area of an Industrial Park. For this purpose a unit means any separate and distinct entity for the purpose of one and more state of Central Tax laws.
- Necessary approvals, including that for foreign direct investment or non-resident Indian investment by the Foreign Investment Promotion Board or Reserve Bank of India or any authority specified under any law for the time being in force, shall be taken separately as per the policy and procedures in force.
- The tax benefits under the Act can be availed of only after the number of units indicated in Para 1 (vii) of this Notification, are located in the Industrial Park.
- M/s. BIP Developers Private Limited, shall continue to operate the Industrial Park during the period in which the benefits under clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of section 80 IA of the Income-Tax Act, 1961 are to be availed.
- In case the commencement of the Industrial Park is delayed by more than one year from the date indicated in Para 1(xi) of this notification, fresh approval will be required under the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002, for availing benefits under sub-section 4(iii) of Section 80-IA of the Income Tax Act, 1961.
- The approval will be invalid and M/s. BIP Developers Private Limited, shall be solely responsible for any repercussions of such invalidity, if—
 - the application on the basis of which the approval is accorded by the Central Government contains wrong information/misinformation or some material information has not been provided in it;
 - it is for the location of the Industrial Park for which approval has already been accorded in the name of another undertaking.

10. In case M/s. ~~BIP~~ Developers Private Limited, transfers the operation and maintenance of the industrial park (i.e., transferor undertaking) to another undertaking (i.e., the transferee undertaking), the transferor and transferee shall jointly intimate to the Entrepreneurial Assistance Unit of the Secretariat for Industrial Assistance, Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-11 along with a copy of the agreement executed between the transferor and transferee undertaking for the aforesaid transfer.
11. The conditions mentioned in this notification as well as those included in the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002 should be adhered to during the period for which benefits under this scheme are to be availed. The Central Government may withdraw the above approval in case M/s. BIP Developers Private Limited, fails to comply with any of the conditions.
12. Any amendment of the project plan without the approval of the Central Government or detection in future, or failure on the part of the applicant to disclose any material fact, will invalidate the approval of the industrial park.

[Notification No. 281/2006/F. No. 178/63/2005-ITA-I]

DEEPAK GARG, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2006

(आयकर)

का.आ. 4392—जबकि आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) (यहां आगे उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार ने 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2002 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये संख्या का.आ. 193(अ) दिनांक 30 मार्च, 1999 के जरिये तथा 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2006 को समाप्त अवधि के लिए संख्या का.आ. 354(अ) के जरिए भारत सरकार, वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग) की अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की योजना निर्मित और अधिसूचित की है;

और जबकि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड जिसका पंजीकृत कार्यालय उद्योग भवन, तिलक मार्ग, जयपुर-302005 में है, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र झुनझुन, फेज-II, जिला झुनझुन, राजस्थान में एक औद्योगिक पार्क का विकास कर रहा है;

और जबकि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस अधिसूचना के अनुबंध में उल्लिखित नियम और शर्तों के अधीन वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्रालय के दिनांक 24-4-2006 के पत्र सं. 15/191/2005-आई पी एंड आई डी के अन्तर्गत उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क अनुमोदित किया है;

इसलिए, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 80झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र

सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनार्थ औद्योगिक पार्क के रूप में मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर द्वारा विकसित तथा अनुरक्षित एवं प्रचालित किए जा रहे उक्त उपक्रम को अधिसूचित करती है।

अनुबंध

नियम एवं शर्तें जिन पर भारत सरकार ने मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क के गठित किए जाने हेतु अनुमोदन प्रदान किया है।

1. (i) औद्योगिक उपक्रम का नाम : राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड
- (ii) प्रस्तावित स्थान : औद्योगिक क्षेत्र झुनझुन, फेज-II, जिला झुनझुन, राजस्थान
- (iii) औद्योगिक पार्क का क्षेत्रफल : 124.06 एकड़
- (iv) प्रस्तावित कार्यकलाप :

एन आई सी संहिता के साथ औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप का स्वरूप

क्रम सं.	एन आई सी संहिता				विवरण
	अनुभाग	प्रभाग	समूह	श्रेणी	
क	2 और 3	विनिर्माण कार्यकलाप

- (v) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित आबंटनीय क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत : 100%
- (vi) वाणिज्यिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत : शून्य
- (vii) औद्योगिक यूनितों की न्यूनतम संख्या : 160 यूनितें
- (viii) प्रस्तावित कुल निवेश (राशि रुपयों में) : 256.78 लाख
- (ix) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश (राशि रुपयों में) : शून्य
- (x) अवसंरचनात्मक विकास पर निवेश जिसमें औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश भी शामिल है (राशि रुपयों में) : 202.18 लाख

(xi) औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ : 31-3-2006
होने की प्रस्तावित तिथि

2. किसी औद्योगिक पार्क में अवसंरचना विकास पर न्यूनतम निवेश कुल परियोजना लागत के 50% से कम नहीं होगा। ऐसे औद्योगिक पार्क जो औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए भूमित स्थल प्रदान करता है, के मामले में औद्योगिक स्थल के निर्माण कार्य की लागत सहित विकास अवसंरचना पर न्यूनतम खर्च कुल परियोजना लागत के 60% से कम नहीं होगा।

3. संरचना विकास में सड़क (सम्पर्क सड़क सहित), जलापूर्ति तथा सीवरज, दूषित जल शोधन सुविधा, टेलीफोन नेटवर्क, विद्युत उत्पादन एवं वितरण, वातानुकूलन तथा ऐसी अन्य सुविधाएं जो औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप हेतु सामान्य उपयोग के लिए हैं जो वाणिज्यिक दृष्टि से निर्धारणीय एवं प्रयुक्त हैं।

4. दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2002 की का.आ. 354(अ) के पैराग्राफ 6 के उप पैराग्राफ (ख) में निर्दिष्ट तालिका के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित कोई एकल इकाई किसी औद्योगिक पार्क के लिए नियत औद्योगिक क्षेत्र का 50% से अधिक हिस्सा धारित नहीं करेगी। इस प्रयोजनार्थ किसी इकाई का आशय एक या एक से अधिक राज्य अथवा केन्द्रीय कर कानून के प्रयोजन के लिए किसी अलग तथा भिन्न कम्पनी से है।

5. आवश्यक अनुमोदनों, जिनमें विदेशी निवेश संवर्धन बोर्ड अथवा भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक अथवा उस समय प्रवृत्त किसी कानून के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट किसी प्राधिकरण द्वारा विदेशी प्रत्यक्ष निवेश अथवा अनिवासी भारतीय निवेश के लिए अनुमोदन शामिल है, को प्रवृत्त नीति तथा प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार अलग से लिया जाएगा।

6. इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1(vii) में विनिर्दिष्ट संख्या में इकाइयों के औद्योगिक पार्क में अवस्थित होने के उपरान्त ही इस अधिनियम के अंतर्गत कर लाभ प्राप्त हो सकते हैं।

7. मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर उस अवधि के दौरान औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन जारी रखेगा जिस अवधि में आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80एक क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ लिए जाने हैं।

8. यदि उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने में इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1(xi) में निर्दिष्ट तिथि से एक वर्ष से ज्यादा विलम्ब होता है तो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80एक क की उप-धारा (4) (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त करने के लिए औद्योगिक पार्क योजना, 2002 के अंतर्गत नया अनुमोदन प्राप्त करना अपेक्षित होगा।

9. यह अनुमोदन अवैध रहेगा और मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर ऐसी अवैधता के परिणामों के लिए स्वयं ही जिम्मेदार होगा, यदि

(i) आवेदन पत्र जिसके आधार पर केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया है, में गलत सूचना/सूचना अथवा कतिपय तथ्यपरक सूचना न दी गई हो।

(ii) यह उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क की अवस्थिति हेतु है जिसके लिए अनुमोदन किसी अन्य उपक्रम के नाम में पहले ही प्रदान किया गया है।

10. यदि मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर (अर्थात् अन्तरणकर्ता उपक्रम) औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन और अनुरक्षण किसी दूसरे उपक्रम (अर्थात् अंतरिती उपक्रम) को हस्तांतरित करेगा तो अंतरणकर्ता और अंतरिती उपर्युक्त हस्तांतरण के लिए अंतरणकर्ता और अंतरिती उपक्रम के बीच निष्पक्षित करार की शर्त के साथ औद्योगिक सहायता सचिवालय, औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11 की उद्यमशीलता सहायता यूनिट संबुद्ध रूप से सूचित करेंगे।

11. इस अधिसूचना में उल्लिखित शर्तों के साथ-साथ औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में शामिल उन शर्तों का अनुपालन उस अवधि के दौरान किया जाना चाहिए जिसके लिए इस स्कीम के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त किए जाने हैं। केन्द्र सरकार उपर्युक्त अनुमोदन को वापस ले सकती है। मैसर्स राजस्थान स्टेट इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, जयपुर औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में विहित शर्तों अथवा इस अधिसूचना की किसी भी शर्त के अनुपालन में असफल रहता है।

12. केन्द्र सरकार के अनुमोदन के बिना प्रोजेक्ट प्लान में किया गया कोई भी संशोधन अथवा भविष्य में पता लगना अथवा किसी ठोस तथ्य का उद्घाटन करने में आवेदक का असफल रहना, औद्योगिक पार्क के अनुमोदन को अवैध बना देना।

[अधिसूचना सं. 278/2006/फा. सं. 178/76/2006-आ.क.नि.-I]

दीपक गर्ग, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2006

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 4392.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), has framed and notified a scheme for industrial park, by the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion) vide number S.O. 193(E), dated the 30th March, 1999, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2002 and vide number S.O. 354(E), dated the 1st day April, 2002, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2006;

And whereas M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, having registered office at Udyog Bhawan, Tilak Marg, Jaipur-302005 is developing an Industrial Park at Industrial Area Jhunjhunu, Phase-II, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan;

And whereas the Central Government has approved the said Industrial Park *vide* Ministry of Commerce and Industry letter No. 15/191/2005-IP&ID dated 24-4-2006 subject to the terms and conditions mentioned in the annexure to his notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the said Act, the Central Government hereby notifies the undertaking being developed and being maintained and operated by M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, as an industrial park for the purposes of the said clause (iii).

ANNEXURE

The terms and conditions on which the approval of the Government of India has been accorded for setting up of an industrial park by M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur.

1. (i) Name of the Industrial Undertaking : Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited.

(ii) Proposed location : Industrial Area, Jhunjhunu, Phase-II, District-Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

(iii) Area of Industrial Park : 124.06 Acres.

(iv) Proposed Activities :

Nature of Industrial activity with NIC code

S. No.	NIC Code				Description
	Section	Division	Group	Class	
A	2 & 3	—	—	—	Manufacturing

(v) Percentage of allocable area earmarked for Industrial use : 100%

(vi) Percentage of allocable area earmarked for commercial use : Nil

(vii) Minimum number of industrial units : 160 Units

(viii) Total investments proposed (Amount in Rupees) : 256.78 lakhs

(ix) Investment on built up space for Industrial use (Amount in Rupees) : Nil

(x) Investment on Infrastructure Development including investment on built up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees) : 202.18 lakhs

(xi) Proposed date of commencement of the Industrial Park : 31-03-2006

- The minimum investment on infrastructure development in an Industrial Park shall not be less than 50% of the total project cost. In the case of an Industrial Park which provides built-up space for industrial use, the minimum expenditure on infrastructure development including cost of construction of industrial space, shall not be less than 60% of the total project cost.
- Infrastructure development shall include, roads (including approach roads), water supply and sewerage, common effluent treatment facility, telecom network, generation and distribution of power, air-conditioning and such other facilities as are for common use for industrial activity which are identifiable and are provided on commercial terms.
- No single unit referred to in column (2) of the Table given in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 6 of S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st April, 2002, shall occupy more than fifty per cent of the allocable industrial area of an Industrial Park. For this purpose a unit means any separate and distinct entity for the purpose of one and more State or Central tax laws.
- Necessary approvals, including that for foreign direct investment or non-resident Indian investment by the Foreign Investment Promotion Board or Reserve Bank of India or any authority specified under any law for the time being in force, shall be taken separately as per the policy and procedures in force.
- The tax benefits under the Act can be availed of only after the number of units indicated in Para 1(vii) of this Notification, are located in the Industrial Park.
- M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, shall continue to operate the Industrial Park during the period in which the benefits under clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 are to be availed.

8. In case the commencement of the Industrial Park is delayed by more than one year from the date indicated in Para 1(xi) of this notification, fresh approval will be required under the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002, for availing benefits under sub-section 4(iii) of Section 80-1A of the Income Tax Act, 1961.
9. The approval will be invalid and M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, shall be solely responsible for any repercussions of such invalidity, if:
 - (i) the application on the basis of which the approval is accorded by the Central Government contains wrong information/misinformation or some material information has not been provided in it.
 - (ii) it is for the location of the Industrial Park for which approval has already been accorded in the name of another undertaking.
10. In case M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, transfer the operation and maintenance of the Industrial Park (i.e. transferor undertaking) to another undertaking (i.e. the transferee undertaking), the transferor and transferee shall jointly intimate to the Entrepreneurial Assistance Unit of the Secretariat for Industrial Assistance, Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-II along with a copy of the agreement executed between the transferor and transferee undertaking for the aforesaid transfer.
11. The conditions mentioned in this notification as well as those included in the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002 should be adhered to during the period for which benefits under this scheme are to be availed. The Central Government may withdraw the above approval in case M/s. Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Limited, Jaipur, fails to comply with any of the conditions.
12. Any amendment of the project plan without the approval of the Central Government or detection in future, or failure on the part of the applicant to disclose any material fact, will invalidate the approval of the industrial park.

[Notification No. 278/2006/F.No. 178/76/2006-ITA-I]

DEEPAK GARG, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2006

(आयकर)

का.आ. 4393—जबकि आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) (यहां आगे उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार ने 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2002 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये संख्या का.आ. 193(अ) दिनांक 30 मार्च, 1999 के जरिये तथा 1 अप्रैल, 1997 से शुरू होकर तथा 31 मार्च, 2006 को समाप्त अवधि के लिए संख्या का.आ. 354(अ) के जरिए भारत सरकार, वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग) की अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की योजना निर्मित और अधिसूचित की है;

और जबकि मैसर्स विजाग आईटी पार्क लिमिटेड, जिसका पंजीकृत कार्यालय वी यू डी ए कम्पाउंड, सीरीपुरम, विशाखापटनम-530003 में है, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र वी यू डी ए कम्पाउंड, सीरीपुरम, विशाखापटनम (जिला विशाखापटनम), आन्ध्र प्रदेश-530003 में एक औद्योगिक पार्क का विकास कर रहा है ;

और जबकि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस अधिसूचना के अनुबंध में उल्लिखित नियम और शर्तों के अधीन वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्रालय के दिनांक 1-09-2004 के पत्र सं. 15/18/2004-आई पी एंड आई डी के अन्तर्गत उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क अनुमोदित किया है;

इसलिए, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनार्थ औद्योगिक पार्क के रूप में मैसर्स विजाग आईटी पार्क लिमिटेड, विशाखापटनम द्वारा विकसित तथा अनुरक्षित एवं प्रचालित किए जा रहे उक्त उपक्रम को अधिसूचित करती है ।

अनुबंध

नियम एवं शर्तें जिन पर भारत सरकार ने मैसर्स विजाग आईटी पार्क लिमिटेड, विशाखापटनम द्वारा औद्योगिक पार्क की गठित किए जाने हेतु अनुमोदन प्रदान किया है -

1. (i) औद्योगिक उपक्रम : मैसर्स विजाग आईटी
का नाम पार्क लिमिटेड,
- (ii) प्रस्तावित स्थान : वी यू डी ए कम्पाउंड,
सीरीपुरम
विशाखापटनम (जिला
विशाखापटनम), आन्ध्र
प्रदेश-530003
- (iii) औद्योगिक पार्क का : 2 एकड़
क्षेत्रफल

(iv) प्रस्तावित कार्यकलाप :

एन आई सी संहिता के साथ औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप का स्वरूप

क्रम सं.	एन आई सी संहिता				विवरण
	अनुभाग	प्रभाग	समूह	श्रेणी	
क	8	89	892	—	डाटा प्रोसेसिंग साफ्टवेयर डेवलपमेंट एंड कम्प्यूटर कन्सल्टेन्सी सर्विसिज

(v) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित आबंटनीय क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत : 85%

(vi) वाणिज्यिक उपयोग के लिए निर्धारित क्षेत्र का प्रतिशत : 5%

(vii) औद्योगिक यूनिटों की न्यूनतम संख्या : 5 यूनिटें

(viii) प्रस्तावित कुल निवेश (राशि रुपयों में) : 35 करोड़

(ix) औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश (राशि रुपयों में) : 25 करोड़

(x) अवसंरचनात्मक विकास पर निवेश जिसमें औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थान पर निवेश भी शामिल है (राशि रुपयों में) : 32.80 करोड़

(xi) औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने की प्रस्तावित तिथि : 01-03-2004

2. किसी औद्योगिक पार्क में अवसंरचना विकास पर न्यूनतम निवेश कुल परियोजना लागत के 50% से कम नहीं होगा। ऐसे औद्योगिक पार्क जो औद्योगिक उपयोग के लिए निर्मित स्थल प्रदान करता है, के मामले में औद्योगिक स्थल के निर्माण कार्य की लागत सहित विकास अवसंरचना पर न्यूनतम खर्च कुल परियोजना लागत के 60% से कम नहीं होगा।

3. संरचना विकास में सड़क (संपर्क सड़क सहित), जलापूर्ति तथा सीवरेज, दूषित जल शोधन सुविधा, टेलिकॉम नेटवर्क, विद्युत उत्पादन एवं वितरण, वातानुकूलन तथा ऐसी अन्य सुविधाएं जो औद्योगिक कार्यकलाप हेतु सामान्य उपयोग के लिए हैं जो वाणिज्यिक दृष्टि से निर्धारणीय एवं प्रयुक्त हैं।

4. दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2002 की का.आ. 354(अ) के पैराग्राफ 6 के उप पैराग्राफ (ख) में निर्दिष्ट तालिका के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित कोई एकल इकाई किसी औद्योगिक पार्क के लिए नियत औद्योगिक क्षेत्र का 50% से अधिक हिस्सा धारित नहीं करेगी। इस प्रयोजनार्थ किसी इकाई का आशय एक या एक से अधिक राज्य अथवा केन्द्रीय कर कानून के प्रयोजन के लिए किसी अलग तथा भिन्न कम्पनी से है।

5. आवश्यक अनुमोदनों, जिनमें विदेशी निवेश संवर्धन बोर्ड अथवा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अथवा उस समय प्रवृत्त किसी कानून के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट किसी प्राधिकरण द्वारा विदेशी प्रत्यक्ष निवेश अथवा अनिवासी भारतीय निवेश के लिए अनुमोदन शामिल है, को प्रवृत्त नीति तथा प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार अलग से लिया जाएगा।

6. इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1(vii) में विनिर्दिष्ट संख्या में इकाइयों के औद्योगिक पार्क में अवस्थित होने के उपरान्त ही इस अधिनियम के अंतर्गत कर लाभ प्राप्त हो सकते हैं।

7. मैसर्स विजाग आई टी पार्क लिमिटेड, विशाखापटनम उस अवधि के दौरान औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन जारी रखेगा जिस अवधि में आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80 झ क की उप-धारा (4) के खंड (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ लिए जाने हैं।

8. यदि उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क के आरंभ होने में इस अधिसूचना के पैरा 1(xi) में निर्दिष्ट तिथि से एक वर्ष से ज्यादा विलम्ब होता है तो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 80झ क की उपधारा 4 (iii) के अंतर्गत लाभ प्राप्त करने के लिए औद्योगिक पार्क योजना, 2002 के अंतर्गत नया अनुमोदन प्राप्त करना अपेक्षित होगा।

9. यह अनुमोदन अवैध रहेगा और मैसर्स विजाग आई टी पार्क लिमिटेड, विशाखापटनम ऐसी अवैधता के परिणामों के लिए स्वयं ही जिम्मेदार होगा, यदि—

(i) आवेदन पत्र जिसके आधार पर केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा अनुमोदन प्रदान किया गया है, में गलत सूचना/सूचना अथवा कतिपय तथ्यपरक सूचना न दी गई हो।

(ii) यह उक्त औद्योगिक पार्क की अवस्थिति हेतु है जिसके लिए अनुमोदन किसी अन्य उपक्रम के नाम में पहले ही प्रदान किया गया है।

10. यदि मैसर्स विजाग आई टी पार्क लिमिटेड, विशाखापटनम (अर्थात् अन्तरणकर्ता उपक्रम) औद्योगिक पार्क का प्रचालन और अनुरक्षण किसी दूसरे उपक्रम (अर्थात् अंतर्गती उपक्रम) को हस्तांतरित करेगा तो अंतरणकर्ता और अंतर्गती उपर्युक्त हस्तांतरण के लिए अंतरणकर्ता और अंतर्गती उपक्रम के बीच निष्पादित करार की प्रति के साथ औद्योगिक सहायता सचिवालय, औद्योगिक नीति और संवर्धन विभाग, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11 की उद्यमशीलता सहायता यूनिट को संयुक्त रूप से सूचित करेंगे।

11. इस अधिसूचना में उल्लिखित शर्तों के साथ-साथ औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में शामिल उन शर्तों का अनुपालन उस अवधि के दौरान किया जाना चाहिए जिसके लिए इस स्कीम के अंतर्गत लाभ

प्राप्त किए जाते हैं। केन्द्र सरकार उपर्युक्त अनुमोदन को वापस ले सकती है। यदि मैसर्स विजाग आईटी पार्क लिमिटेड, विशाखापट्टनम औद्योगिक पार्क स्कीम, 2002 में विहित शर्तों अथवा इस अधिसूचना की किसी भी शर्त के अनुपालन में असफल रहता है।

12. केन्द्र सरकार के अनुमोदन के बिना प्रोजेक्ट प्लान में किया गया कोई भी संशोधन अथवा परिवर्धन या वृद्धि अथवा किसी ठोस तथ्य का उद्घाटन करने में आवेदक को असफल रहना, औद्योगिक पार्क के अनुमोदन को अवैध बना देगा।

[अधिसूचना सं. 282/2006/फा. सं. 178/39/2005-ऑ.क. नि.-1]

सीपक गर्ग, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2006

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 4393—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), has framed and notified a scheme for industrial park, by the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion) vide number S.O. 193(E), dated the 30th March, 1999, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2002 and vide number S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st day April, 2002, for the period beginning on the 1st day of April, 1997 and ending on the 31st day of March, 2006;

And whereas M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, having registered office at VUDA Compound, Siripuram, Visakhapatnam-530003, is developing an Industrial Park at VUDA Compound, Siripuram, Visakhapatnam, (Visakhapatnam District), Andhra Pradesh-530003;

And whereas the Central Government has approved the said Industrial Park vide Ministry of Commerce and Industry letter No. 15/18/2004-IP&ID dated 1-9-2004 subject to the terms and conditions mentioned in the annexure to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80-IA of the said Act, the Central Government hereby notifies the undertaking being developed and being maintained and operated by M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, Visakhapatnam, as an industrial park for the purposes of the said clause (iii).

ANNEXURE

The terms and conditions on which the approval of the Government of India has been accorded for setting up of an industrial park by M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, Visakhapatnam.

1. (i) Name of the Industrial Undertaking : Vizag IT Park Limited.
- (ii) Proposed location : VUDA Compound, Siripuram, Visakhapatnam, (Visakhapatnam District), Andhra Pradesh-530003.
- (iii) Area of Industrial Park : 2 Acres.
- (iv) Proposed activities :

Nature of Industrial activity with NIC Code

S. No	NIC Code				Description
	Section	Division	Group	Class	
A	8	89	892	—	Data Processing, software development and computer consultancy services.

- (v) Percentage of allocable area earmarked for Industrial use : 85%
- (vi) Percentage of allocable area earmarked for commercial use : 5%
- (vii) Minimum number of industrial units : 5 Units
- (viii) Total investments proposed (Amount in Rupees) : 35 crores
- (ix) Investment on built up space for Industrial use (Amount in Rupees) : 25 crores
- (x) Investment on Infrastructure Development including investment on built-up space for industrial use (Amount in Rupees) : 32.80 crores
- (xi) Proposed date of commencement of the Industrial Park : 1-3-2004

2. The minimum investment on infrastructure development in an Industrial Park shall not be less than 50% of the total project cost. In the case of an Industrial Park which provides built-up space for industrial use, the minimum expenditure on infrastructure development including cost of construction of industrial space, shall not be less than 60% of the total project cost.
3. Infrastructure development shall include, roads (including approach roads), water supply and sewerage, common effluent treatment facility, telecom network, generation and distribution of power, air-conditioning and such other facilities as are for common use for industrial activity which are identifiable and are provided on commercial terms.
4. No single unit referred to in column (2) of the Table given in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 6 of S.O. 354(E) dated the 1st April, 2002, shall occupy more than fifty per cent of the allocable industrial area of an Industrial Park. For this purpose a unit means any separate and distinct entity for the purpose of one and more State or Central tax laws.
5. Necessary approvals, including that for foreign direct investment or non-resident Indian investment by the Foreign Investment Promotion Board or Reserve Bank of India or any authority specified under any law for the time being in force, shall be taken separately as per the policy and procedures in force.
6. The tax benefits under the act can be availed of only after the number of units indicated in Para 1(vii) of this Notification, are located in the Industrial Park.
7. M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, Visakhapatnam, shall continue to operate the Industrial Park during the period in which the benefits under clause (iii) of sub-section (4) of Section 80IA of the Income-tax Act, 1961 are to be availed.
8. In case the commencement of the Industrial Park is delayed by more than one year from the date indicated in Para 1(xi) of this notification, fresh approval will be required under the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002, for availing benefits under sub-section 4(iii) of Section 80IA of the Income Tax Act, 1961.
9. The approval will be invalid and M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, Visakhapatnam, shall be solely responsible for any repercussions of such invalidity, if:
 - (i) the application on the basis of which the approval is accorded by the Central Government contains wrong information/misinformation or some material information has not been provided in it.
 - (ii) it is for the location of the industrial park for which approval has already been accorded in the name of another undertaking.
10. In case M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, Visakhapatnam, transfer the operation and maintenance of the industrial park (i.e. transferor undertaking) to another undertaking (i.e. the transferee undertaking), the transferor and transferee shall jointly intimate to the Entrepreneurial Assistance Unit of the Secretariat for Industrial Assistance, Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-11 along with a copy of the agreement executed between the transferor and transferee undertaking for the aforesaid transfer.
11. The conditions mentioned in this notification as well as those included in the Industrial Park Scheme, 2002 should be adhered to during the period for which benefits under this scheme are to be availed. The Central Government may withdraw the above approval in case M/s. Vizag IT Park Limited, Visakhapatnam, fails to comply with any of the conditions.
12. Any amendment of the project plan without the approval of the Central Government or detection in future, or failure on the part of the applicant to disclose any material fact, will invalidate the approval of the Industrial Park.

[Notification No. 282/2006/F. No. 178/39/2005-ITA-I]

DEEPAK GARG, Under Secy.

विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

(विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4394—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन स्वायत्तशासी संस्थान, विज्ञान प्रसार, नोएडा (उत्तर प्रदेश) को, जिनके 80% कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. 11028/1/2005-(रा.भा.)]

नीलाम्बर पाण्डेय, संयुक्त निदेशक (रा.भा.)

MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**(Department of Science and Technology)**

New Delhi, the 7th November, 2006

S. O. 4394.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies Vigyan Prasara, Noida, U. P. an autonomous institution under the Administrative Control of Ministry of Science and Technology, 80% staff where of have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No. 11028/1/2005(OL)]

NILAMBAR PANDEY, Jt. Director (OL)

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4395.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन भारतीय सर्वेक्षण विभाग के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80% कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

1. जम्मू और कश्मीर भू-स्थानिक आंकड़ा केन्द्र, भारतीय सर्वेक्षण विभाग, जम्मू।
2. दक्षिणी मुद्रण वर्ग, भारतीय सर्वेक्षण विभाग, हैदराबाद (आन्ध्र प्रदेश)।

[फा. सं. 11028/1/2005(रा.भा.)]

नीलाम्बर पाण्डेय, संयुक्त निदेशक (रा.भा.)

New Delhi, the 7th November, 2006

S. O. 4395.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of Survey of India under the Administrative Control of Ministry of Science and Technology, 80% staff where of have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

1. Jammu and Kashmir Geo-spatial Data Centre, Survey of India, Jammu.
2. Southern Printing Group, Survey of India, Hyderabad (A.P.).

[F. No. 11028/1/2005(OL)]

NILAMBAR PANDEY, Jt. Director (OL)

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4396.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन स्वायत्तशासी संस्थान, प्रौद्योगिकी सूचना, पूर्वानुमान एवं मूल्यांकन परिषद्, नई दिल्ली को, जिनके 80% कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. 11028/1/2005-(रा.भा.)]

नीलाम्बर पाण्डेय, संयुक्त निदेशक (रा.भा.)

New Delhi, the 7th November, 2006

S. O. 4396.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies Technology Information, Forecasting and Assessment Council (TIFAC), New Delhi, an autonomous Institution under the Administrative Control of Ministry of Science and Technology, 80% staff where of have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No. 11028/1/2005(OL)]

NILAMBAR PANDEY, Jt. Director (OL)

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 20 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4397.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 20-06-2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुम्बई सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

1. प्रो. चन्दन सिंह रोटेले, 31/4, प्रियदर्शनी अपार्टमेंट्स, निकट आर.टी.ओ., नागपुर-10,
2. श्री नन्दू सादु बनसोडे, सिमला नगर, डी.एक्स 125-1/2, नेनीयन सी रोड, मालाबार हिल, मुम्बई-36

[फा. सं. 809/1/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 20th October, 2006

S. O. 4397.—In continuation of this Ministry's notification of even number dated 20-06-2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Mumbai Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

1. Prof. Chandansingh Rotele, 31/4, Priyadarshani Apartments Near RTO, Nagpur-10.
2. Shri Nandu Sadu Bansode, Simla Nagar, DX 125-1/2, Nepean Sea Road, Malabar Hill, Mumbai-36.

[F. No. 809/1/2004-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4398.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 30 अगस्त, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के दिल्ली सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में सुश्री रेणु मित्तल, निवासी मकान सं. 4, सेक्टर 28, अरूण विहार, नोएडा-201301 को नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/7/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4398.—In continuation of this Ministry's notification of even number dated 30th August, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Ms. Renu Mittal, House No. 4, Sector 28, Arun Vihar, Noida-201301 as member of the Delhi Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 809/7/2004-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4399.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 15 जून, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के तिरुवनंतपुरम सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में श्री अनिल थॉमस, वडाक्केविल्डिल, अनिल विला, पावर स्टेशन के निकट, पथानामथिट्टा पोस्ट ऑफिस और जिला, केरल-689645 को नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/9/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4399.—In continuation of this Ministry's notification of even number dated 15th June, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint

Shri Anil Thomas, Vadakkeveettil Anil Villa, Near Power Station, Pathanamthitta P. O. & District, Kerala-689645 as a member of the Thiruvananthapuram advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 809/9/2004-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4400.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 15 जून, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के तिरुवनंतपुरम सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:

1. सुश्री दीप्ती मेरी वर्गीस, थाडाटेल, 35/644-ए, जनथा, सं. नार्थ पलारिवट्टम, कोची-25
2. श्री अनिल कुमार के. पी. अध्यक्ष, केरल पी. वाइ. सी., 1/4703, वाइकुंडम, बिलाथिकुलम, अर्निपालम पी. ओ. कालीकट-673010

[फा. सं. 809/9/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th October, 2006

S.O. 4400.—In continuation of this Ministry's notification of even number dated 15th June, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Thiruvananthapuram Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier:

1. Ms. Deepthi Mary Varghese, Thadathel, 35/644-A, Janatha, Jn. North Palarivattom, Kochi-25.
2. Shri Anil Kumar K. P. President, Kerala PYC, 1/4703, Vykundam, Bilathikulam, Ernhipalam P.O., Calicut-673010.

[F. No. 809/9/2004-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4401.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 12 जुलाई, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र

अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, एतद्वारा केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के बंगलूर सलाहकार पैनल से निम्नलिखित सदस्यों को तत्काल प्रभाव से हटाती है :

1. श्री के. कृष्णाप्पा
2. डॉ. देवकटकशम गिडियोन
3. श्री के. जी. सुब्रमण्यस्वामी
4. श्री बासवराज उल्लागड्डी
5. श्रीमती मंजुला राज
6. श्री एम. डी. पल्लवी
7. श्रीमती नहीद अठाउल्ला
8. श्री टी. एन. सीताराम
9. डॉ. सिद्धालिंगैया
10. श्री वाई. एच. विजय कुमार

[फा. सं. 809/5/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4401.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 12-7-2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government hereby removes the following members from the Bangalore Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect :

- 1, Shri K. Krishnappa
2. Dr. Devakataksham Gideon
3. Shri K. G. Subramanyaswamy
4. Shri Basavaraj Ullagaddi
5. Smt. Manjula Raj
6. Shri M. D. Pallavi
7. Smt. Naheed Athaulla
8. Shri T. N. Seetharam
9. Dr. Siddhalingaiah
10. Shri Y. H. Vijay Kumar

[F. No. 809/5/2004-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4402—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 5 फरवरी, 2005 और 3 जून, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और आंशिक आशोधन में चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 3 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, श्रीमती मालविका सिंह के स्थान पर

श्रीमती एम. श्रीमणी को तत्काल प्रभाव से और अगले आदेशों तक केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 809/12/2003-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 19th October, 2006

S.O. 4402—In continuation and in partial modification of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 5th February, 2005 and 3rd June, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rule 3 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Smt. M. Sri Mani in place of Smt. Malvika Singh as member of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect and until further orders.

[F.No.809/12/2003-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4403—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 20-6-2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुम्बई सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:

1. सुश्री योगिता तई वी. नंदरकर द्वारा अश्वरदास बोरकर, लक्ष्मी नगर, वार्ड सं. 11, डी.एड. कॉलेज के निकट, गोंडिया, जिला गोंडिया, महाराष्ट्र-232514
2. श्री शरद वी अहेर, अध्यक्ष, महाराष्ट्र वी.वाई.सी. विश्व सत्या, ओजर (एम.आई.जी) टाल : निपाद, नासिक, महाराष्ट्र।
3. श्री सुनील अहीरे, 204/8230, कन्मवार नगर-I, विखरोली मुम्बई-400 083।

[फा. सं. 809/1/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th October, 2006

S.O. 4403.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 20-6-2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Mumbai Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

- (1) Ms. Yogita Tai V. Nandarkar, C/o Ashwardas Boarkar, Laxminagar, Ward No. 11, Near D. Ed. College, Gondia, Distt. Gondia, Maharashtra-232514.

- (2) Shri Sharad V. Aher, President, Maharashtra PYC, Vishwa Sattya, Ozar (Mig), Tal : Nipad, Nasik, Maharashtra.
- (3) Shri Sunil Ahire, 204/8230, Kannamwar Nagar-I, Vikhroli, Mumbai-400083.

[F. No. 809/1/2004-F (C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4404-इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 30 अगस्त, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के दिल्ली सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

1. श्री प्रदीप जैलदार
2. श्री सतविंदर सिंह संधु
3. श्री नितिन शर्मा
4. श्री विक्रम मल्होत्रा
5. श्री मोहम्मद आमिन भट
6. सुश्री परप्रीत बरार
7. श्री अमरिंदर सिंह 'राजा'
8. श्री रमिन्दर अवला
9. सुश्री चयनिका उनियाल
10. श्री मनीष धरनिया
11. श्री नीरज डांगी
12. श्री प्रकाश जोशी
13. श्री राजपाल खैरोला
14. श्री योगेश दीक्षित
15. श्री नदीम अशरफ जायसी
16. सुश्री मधुमिता चक्रवर्ती
17. श्री सुखपाल सिंह भुल्लर

[फा. सं. 809/7/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th October, 2006

S.O. 4404—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 30 August, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Delhi Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

1. Shri Pradeep Zaildar

2. Shri Satvinder Singh Sandhu
3. Shri Nitin Sharma
4. Shri Vikram Malhotra
5. Shri Mohd. Amin Bhat
6. Ms. Parpreet Brar
7. Shri Amrinder Singh 'Raja'
8. Shri Raminder Awla
9. Ms. Chaynika Uniyal
10. Shri Manish Dharnia
11. Shri Neeraj Dangi
12. Shri Prakash Joshi
13. Shri Rajpal Khairola
14. Shri Yogesh Dixit
15. Shri Nadeem Ashraf Jaide
16. Ms. Madhumita Chakraborty
17. Shri Sukhpal Singh Bhullar

[F. No. 809/7/2004-F (C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ.4405-इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 12-7-2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के बंगलौर सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है ।

1. श्री नागराज छेबी, नींद्रमठ के निकट, ओल्ड हुबली, हुबली-24
2. श्री शाकिर सनादी, 187, कविर मार्ग, विश्वेश्वर नगर, हुबली-32

[फा.सं. 809/5/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th October, 2006

S.O. 4405—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 12-7-2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Bangalore Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

1. Shri Nagaraj Chebbi, Near Knnendramath, Old Hubli, Hubli-24
2. Shri Shakir Sanadi, 187, Kavirey Marg, Vishweshvar Nagar, Hubli-32.

[F. No. 809/5/2004-F (C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4406.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 7 जून, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार, निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के चेन्नई सलाहकार पैनल के रूप सदस्य के में नियुक्त करती है :

1. श्री के. पांडियन,
अध्यक्ष,
पांडिचेरी पी.वाई.सी. सं. 8 पहला मोड़,
पल्ला स्ट्रीट, मुरुगपक्कम,
पांडिचेरी-605 004 ।
2. श्री मानिक टैगोर,
31-ए, मेगालोई स्ट्रीट,
सेंटमिल नगर, शिवगंगा, तमिलनाडु ।
3. श्री मौर्या जय कुमार,
अध्यक्ष,
तमिलनाडु पी.वाई.सी., कोयम्बदूर ।

[फा.सं. 809/4/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th October, 2006

S.O. 4406.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 7th June, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983 the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Chennai advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

1. Shri K. Pandian,
President,
Pondicherry PYC,
No. 8, 1st Cross,
Palla Street, Murugapakkam,
Pondicherry-605 004.
2. Shri Manick Tagore,
31-A, Megaloi Street,
Sentamil Nagar, Sivaganga, Tamil Nadu.
3. Shri Mayura Jay Kumar,
President,
Tamil Nadu PYC,
Coimbatore.

[F.No. 809/4/2004-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4407.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 5 फरवरी, 2005 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्र सरकार तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के हैदराबाद सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप श्री शेख मस्तान वली, स्वरम नगर, सं. 26-20-264, चैक पोस्ट के निकट गुंटूर, आंध्र प्रदेश, को नियुक्त करती है ।

[फा.सं. 809/3/2004-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th October, 2006

S.O. 4407.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 5th February, 2005 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri Sheikh Mastan Wali, Swaram Nagar, No. 26-20-264, Near Check Post, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh as a member of the Hyderabad advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier .

[File No. 809/3/2004-F (C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

रेल मंत्रालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4408.—रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड), राजभाषा नियम, 1976 (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) के नियम 10 के उपनियम (2) और (4) के अनुसरण में, पश्चिम रेलवे के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जहां 80% से अधिक अधिकारियों/कर्मचारियों ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है :-

1. क्षेत्र अधिकारी कार्यालय, चर्चगेट
2. स्टेशन प्रबंधक कार्यालय, मुंबई सेंट्रल
3. मंडल यांत्रिक इंजीनियर कार्यालय (डीजल), बामी
4. वरिष्ठ मण्डल बिजली इंजीनियर
(कर्षण चल स्टैंक) कार्यालय, वलसाड
5. क्षेत्र प्रबंधक कार्यालय, वलसाड
6. क्षेत्र अधिकारी कार्यालय, सूरत
7. सहायक इंजीनियर कार्यालय, नंदुरबार
8. मुख्य चिकित्सा अधीक्षक कार्यालय, प्रताप नगर,
वडोदरा

9. सहायक इंजीनियर कार्यालय, भ्रांगध्रा
10. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, भ्रांगध्रा
11. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, भरुच
12. रेलवे प्राइमरी स्कूल कार्यालय, भरुच
13. सहायक इंजीनियर (1) कार्यालय, वडोदरा
14. सहायक इंजीनियर (2) कार्यालय, वडोदरा
15. सहायक इंजीनियर (निर्माण) कार्यालय, वडोदरा
16. क्षेत्रीय विद्युत् प्रशिक्षक स्कूल, वडोदरा यार्ड
17. मुख्य चिकित्सा अधीक्षक कार्यालय, साबरमती
18. वरिष्ठ मंडल यांत्रिक इंजीनियर (डीजल शेड) कार्यालय, वटवा
19. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, वटवा
20. सहायक मंडल यांत्रिक इंजीनियर (सवारी एवं माल डिब्बा) कार्यालय, गांधीधाम
21. मंडल यांत्रिक इंजीनियर (भाप) कार्यालय, गांधीधाम
22. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, कांकरिया
23. मंडल सुरक्षा आयुक्त कार्यालय, राजकोट
24. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, मोरबी
25. स्टेशन अधीक्षक कार्यालय, हापा
26. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, हापा
27. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, सुरेन्द्र नगर
28. सहायक मंडल इंजीनियर कार्यालय, बोटाद
29. सहायक मंडल इंजीनियर कार्यालय, पोरबंदर
30. रेलवे माध्यमिक पाठशाला, भावनगर परा
31. मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, महु
32. सहायक मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, नीमच
33. सहायक मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, नसीराबाद
34. सहायक मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, चित्तौड़गढ़
35. वरिष्ठ मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, उज्जैन
36. उप मुख्य संकेत एवं दूर संचार इंजीनियर (निर्माण) कार्यालय, रतलाम
37. सहायक इंजीनियर (कार्य) कार्यालय, रतलाम
38. सहायक इंजीनियर (निर्माण), कार्यालय उज्जैन
39. जनसंपर्क अधिकारी कार्यालय, इंदौर
40. कोचिंग डिपो अधिकारी कार्यालय, इंदौर
41. मंडल बिजली इंजीनियर (कषण वितरक) कार्यालय, उज्जैन

42. कार्यपालक इंजीनियर कार्यालय, उज्जैन
43. वरिष्ठ मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, नीमच
44. वरिष्ठ मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, चित्तौड़गढ़
45. वरिष्ठ मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, दाहोद
46. सहायक मंडल चिकित्सा अधिकारी कार्यालय, स्टेशन दाहोद
47. मुख्य कारखाना प्रबंधक कार्यालय, ईएमयू कारखाना, महालक्ष्मी
48. मुख्य कारखाना प्रबंधक, प्रताप नगर कार्यालय, वडोदरा

[सं. हिंदी-2006/रा. भा. 1/12/1]

कृष्णा शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 10th November, 2006

S.O. 4408.—Ministry of Railways (Railway Board), in pursuance of Sub Rule (2) and (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language Rules, 1976 (use for the Official purposes of the Union) hereby, notify the following Offices of Western Railway, where 80% or more Officers/Employees have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

1. Office of the Area Officer, Churchgate
2. Office of the Station Manager, Mumbai Central
3. Office of the Divisional Mechanical Engineer (Diesel) Bami
4. Office of the Senior Divisional Electrical Engineer (Traction Rolling Stock) Valsad
5. Office of the Area Manager, Valsad
6. Office of the Area Officer, Surat
7. Office of the Assistant Engineer, Nandurbar
8. Office of the Chief Medical Superintendent, Pratapnagar-Vadodara
9. Office of the Assistant Engineer, Dhrangdhra
10. Office of the Divisional Medical Superintendent, Dhrangdhra
11. Office of the Divisional Medical Superintendent, Bharuch
12. Office of the Railway Primary School, Bharuch
13. Office of the Assistant Engineer (1), Vadodara
14. Office of the Assistant Engineer (2), Vadodara
15. Office of the Assistant Engineer (Construction), Vadodara
16. Office of the Zonal Electrical Training School Vadodara, (Yard)
17. Office of the Chief Medical Superintendent, Sabarmati

18. Office of the Senior Divisional Mechanical Engineer (Diesel Shed) Vatwa
19. Office of the Divisional Medical Officer, Vatwa
20. Office of the Assistant Divisional Mechanical Engineer (C&W) Gandhidham
21. Office of the Divisional Mechanical Engineer (Steam) Gandhidham
22. Office of the Divisional Medical Officer, Kankariya
23. Office of the Divisional Security Commissioner, Rajkot
24. Office of the Divisional Medical Officer, Morbi
25. Office of the Station Superintendent, Hapa
26. Office of the Divisional Medical Officer, Hapa
27. Office of the Divisional Medical Officer, Surendra Nagar
28. Office of the Assistant Divisional Engineer, Botad
29. Office of the Assistant Divisional Engineer, Porbandar
30. Office of the Railway Secondary School, Bhavnagar Para
31. Office of the Divisional Medical Officer, Mhow
32. Office of the Assistant Divisional Medical Officer, Neemuch
33. Office of the Assistant Divisional Medical Officer, Naseerabad
34. Office of the Assistant Divisional Medical Officer, Chittorgarh
35. Office of the Senior Divisional Medical Officer, Ujjain
36. Office of the Deputy Chief Signal & Telecommunication Engineer (Construction), Ratlam
37. Office of the Assistant Engineer (Works), Ratlam
38. Office of the Assistant Engineer (Construction), Ujjain
39. Office of the Public Relations Officer, Indore
40. Office of the Coaching Depot Officer, Indore
41. Office of the Divisional Electrical Engineer (Traction Distributor) Ujjain
42. Office of the Executive Engineer, Ujjain
43. Office of the Senior Divisional Medical Officer, Neemuch
44. Office of the Senior Divisional Medical Officer, Chittorgarh
45. Office of the Senior Divisional Medical Officer, Dahod
46. Office of the Assistant Divisional Medical Officer, Station Dahod

47. Office of the Chief Workshop Manager, (EMU Workshop), Mahalaxmi

48. Office of the Chief Workshop Manager, Vadodara.

[F.No.Hindi-2006/O.L. 1/12/1]

KRISHNA SHARMA, Jt. Director, (O.L.)

उपभोक्ता मामले और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 6 नवम्बर, 2006

क्र.आ. 4409-भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे स्थापित हो गए हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अति-क्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस 655 : 2006 एयर डक्ट्स विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 655 : 1963 धातु एयर डक्ट्स विशिष्ट (पुनरीक्षण)	31 अगस्त, 2006
2.	आईएस 7587 : (भाग 2) : 2006 खानों में वाईडिंग के लिए केज सस्पेंशन गियर विशिष्ट भाग 2 कैपल्स (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7587 : (भाग 2) : 1975 खानों में वाईडिंग के लिए केज सस्पेंशन गियर विशिष्ट भाग 2 कैपल्स	30 सितम्बर, 2006

इस भारतीय मानक की प्रतियाँ भारती मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों: नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ : एम. ई. डी./जी-2 :1]

सी.के. वेदा, वैज्ञा. 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (यांत्रिक इंजीनियरिंग)

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 6th November, 2006

S.O. 4409.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been established on the date indicated against each :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards, Established	No. & Year of the Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 655:2006 Air ducts—Specifications (Second revision)	IS 655:1963 Specifications for Metal Air ducts (Revised)	31 August, 2006
2.	IS 7587 (Part 2): 2006 Cage Suspension gear for winding in mines—Specification Part 2 Cappels (first revision)	IS 7587 (Part 2): 2006 Cage suspension gear for winding in mines—Specification Part 2 Cappels	30 September, 2006

Copy of these Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Kolkata Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref: MED/G-2:1]

C. K. VEDA, Sc. F & Head (Mechanical Engineering)

नई दिल्ली, 6 नवम्बर, 2006

क्र.आ. 4410.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	संशोधित भारतीय मानक की संख्या और वर्ष	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस 774: 2004	1 सितम्बर, 2006	31 अक्टूबर, 2006

इस संशोधनों की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों: नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ : सीईडी/राजपत्र]

ए. के. सैनी, वैज्ञा. 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (सिविल इंजीनियरी)

New Delhi, the 6th November, 2006

S.O. 4410.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendments to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Year of the Indian Standards	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 774: 2004	1 September, 2006	31 October, 2006

Copy of these Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref: CED/Gazette]

A. K. SAINI, Sc. 'F' & Head (Civil Engg.)

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4411.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उप-नियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे स्थापित हो गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस 9000 (भाग 7 अनुभाग 1): 2006/आई ई सी 60068-2-27(1987) इलेक्ट्रानिकी एवं विद्युतीय मदों के लिए बेसिक पर्यावरण परीक्षण कार्यविधियाँ, भाग 1 संघट्ट परीक्षण, अनुभाग 1 प्रघात (परीक्षण ईए) (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	—	अगस्त 2006
2.	आई एस 9000 (भाग 7 अनुभाग 7): 2006/आई ई सी 60068-2-75(1997) इलेक्ट्रानिकी एवं विद्युतीय मदों के लिए बेसिक पर्यावरण परीक्षण कार्यविधियाँ, भाग 7 संघट्ट परीक्षण, अनुभाग 7 परीक्षण ई एच हैमर परीक्षण	—	अगस्त 2006
3.	आई एस 9001 (भाग 19): 2006 पर्यावरण परीक्षण — के लिए मार्गदर्शिका भाग 19 साल्ट मिस्ट परीक्षण	—	सितम्बर 2006
4.	आई एस 9000 (भाग 32): 2006/आई ई सी 60068-4(1987) इलेक्ट्रानिकी एवं विद्युतीय मदों के लिए बेसिक पर्यावरण परीक्षण कार्यविधियाँ, भाग 32 विशिष्ट लेखकों के लिए जानकारी—परीक्षण	—	अक्टूबर 2006

इस भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ एल टी डी/जी-75]

सुख बीर सिंह, प्रमुख (एल आई टी डी)

New Delhi, the 7th November, 2006

S. O. 4411.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been established on the date indicated against each :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and year of the Indian Standards Established	No. and year of Indian Standards, if any, superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 9000 (Part 7/Sec 1) : 2006/IEC 60068-2-27(1987) Basic Environmental Testing Procedures for Electronic and Electrical items, Part 7 Impact Test, Sec 7 Shock (Test Ea) (First Revision)	—	August 2006

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	IS: 9000 (Part 7/Sec 7) : 2006/IEC 60068-2-75(1987) Basic Environmental Testing Procedures for Electronic and Electrical items, Part 7 Impact Test, Sec 7 Test Eh : Hammer Tests	—	August, 2006
3.	IS 9001 (Part 19) : 2006 Guidance for Environmental Testing, Part 19 Salt Mist Test	—	September 2006
4.	IS 9000 (Part 32) : 2006/IEC 60068-4(1987) Basic Environmental Testing Procedures for Electronic and Electrical Items, Part 32 Information for Specification Writers—Test Summaries	—	October, 2006

Copy of these Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune and Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref. LTD/G-75]

SUKH BIR SINGH, Head (LTD)

कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 2006

का.आ. 4412.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 29 मार्च, 2005 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 1295, तारीख 29 मार्च, 2005 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में जिसका माप 175.118 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) या 432.72 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित उक्त भूमि के एक भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 175.118 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) या 432.72 एकड़ (लगभग) माप वाली उक्त भूमि में खनिजों के खनन, खदान, बोर करने, उनकी खुदाई और तलाश करने, उन्हें प्राप्त करने, उन पर कार्य करने और उन्हें ले जाने के अधिकारों का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है ।

टिप्पण—(1) : इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक संख्या एससीसीएल/बीएसपी/जीएम (पीएलजी)/लैंड 303 तारीख 22 फरवरी, 2006 का निरीक्षण कलेक्टर, कोरबा (छत्तीसगढ़) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक 1, कार्गिल हाऊस स्ट्रीट कलकत्ता-700001 के कार्यालय में या साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि. (राजस्व विभाग) सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर-495006 (छत्तीसगढ़) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है ।

टिप्पण—(2) : उपरोक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध हैं :—

अर्जन के प्रति आक्षेप :

“8. (1) कोई व्यक्ति, की किसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर संपूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा ।

स्पष्टीकरण :—इस धारा के अंतर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी, कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन सक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और ऐसी सक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

- (2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई हो, जो यह आवश्यक समझता है करने के पश्चात् वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।
- (3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा, जो अधिकार में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता, यदि भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर दिए जाते हैं।

टिप्पणी—(3) : केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाऊस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता 700001 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 4 अप्रैल, 1987 के पृष्ठ 1397 से 1400 पर प्रकाशित अधिसूचना का.आ. सं. 905, तारीख 20 मार्च, 1987 द्वारा सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

अनुसूची

अमरपुर दक्षिण विस्तार ब्लॉक

कोरबा सेल, जिला कोरबा (छत्तीसगढ़)

खनन अधिकार

क्र. सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी हल्का	खेचट सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र (हेक्टेयर में)	टिप्पण
1	जाबाली	33	69	कटघोरा	कोरबा	87.677	भाग
2	सिंघाली	33	68	कटघोरा	कोरबा	59.542	भाग
3	अभईपुर	33	26	कटघोरा	कोरबा	27.899	भाग

कुल 175.118 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) या 432.72 एकड़ (लगभग)

(1) ग्राम जाबाली (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या :

11, 12, 13, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 133, 189, 190 (भाग), 191, 192 (भाग), 193 (भाग)

(2) ग्राम सिंघाली (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या :

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8/1 (भाग), 270 (भाग), 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330 (भाग)

(3) ग्राम अभईपुर में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या :

180 (भाग), 226 (भाग), 227 (भाग), 228 (भाग), 229, 230 (भाग), 231, 233 (भाग), 237 (भाग), 238 (भाग), 240 (भाग), 241 (भाग), 242 से 284

सीमा वर्णन :

- क-ख रेखा ग्राम जाबाली-विजयपुर की सम्मिलित सीमा पर बिन्दु 'क' से आरंभ होती है और उसी सम्मिलित सीमा से होती हुई बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है ।
- ख-ग रेखा ग्राम जाबाली-अभईपुर की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा से होकर गुजरती है उसके बाद ग्राम अभईपुर में प्रवेश करती है और प्लॉट सं. 180, 238, 240, 241, 237, 233, 230, 228, 227, 226 से होते हुए ग्राम सिंघाली में प्रवेश करती है और प्लॉट सं. 8/1, 270 से होकर गुजरती है तथा बिन्दु "ग" पर मिलती है ।
- ग-घ रेखा ग्राम सिंघाली से गुजरती है और प्लॉट सं. 270, 307, 311, 310, 313, 316, 322, 323 की दक्षिणी सीमा से होकर गुजरती है उसके बाद प्लॉट सं. 330 से गुजरती है तथा बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है ।
- घ-क रेखा ग्राम खाबाली में प्लॉट सं. 192, 193, 190 से होकर गुजरती है उसके बाद प्लॉट सं. 11, 129, 116, 133, 125, 104, 12, 13, 11 की पश्चिमी सीमा से होकर गुजरती है और प्रारंभ बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है ।

[सं. 43015/3/2005/पीआरआईडब्ल्यू]

एम. शहाबुद्दीन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 13th November, 2006

S.O. 4412.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 1295, dated the 29th March, 2005 published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 9th April, 2005 under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in the lands measuring 175.118 hectares (approximately) or 432.72 acres (approximately) of the land in the locality specified in the schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the rights to mine, quarry, bore dig and search for, win, work and carry away minerals in the said lands measuring 175.118 hectares (approximately) or 432.72 acres (approximately) described in the schedule appended hereto;

Note 1. The plan bearing number SECL/BSP/GM/PLG/LAND/ 303 dated the 22nd February, 2006 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Korba (Chhattisgarh) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata, 700001 or in the Office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Seepat Road, Bilaspur- 495006 (Chhattisgarh),

Note 2. Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of Section 8 of the said Act, which provides as follows :—

“8 (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation :— It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further inquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either makes a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of Section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government,

containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of the proceedings held by him, the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act."

Note 3. The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata 700 001, has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under Section 3 of the said Act, vide notification number S.O. 905, dated the 20th March, 1987, published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 4th April, at pages 1397 to 1406.

SCHEDULE

Amarpur South Extension Block Korba Area, District Korba (Chhattisgarh)

Mining rights

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari halka number	Khewat number	Tahsil	District	Area (in hectares)	Remarks
1	Jawali	33	69	Katghora	Korba	87.677	part
2	Singhali	33	68	Katghora	Korba	59.542	part
3	Abhaipur	33	26	Katghora	Korba	27.899	part

Total: 175.118 hectares (approximately) or 432.72 acres (approximately).

(1) Plot numbers to be acquired in village Jawali (Part) :

11, 12, 13, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 133, 189, 190 (part), 191, 192 (part), 193 (part).

(2) Plot numbers to be acquired in village Singhali (Part) :

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8/1 (part), 270 (part), 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330 (part).

(3) Plot numbers to be acquired in village Abhaipur (Part) :

180 (part), 226 (part), 227 (part), 228 (part), 229, 230 (part), 231, 233 (part), 237 (part), 238 (part), 240 (part), 241 (part), 242 to 284.

Boundary Description :

- A-B Line Starts from point "A" on the common boundary of village Jawali- Bijaipur and passes along the same common boundary and meets at point "B".
- B-C Line passes along the partly common boundary of village Jawali-Abhaipur, then enter in village Abhaipur and passes through plot numbers 180, 238, 240, 241, 237, 233, 230, 228, 227, 226 then enter in village Singhali and passes through plot numbers 8/1, 270 and meets at point "C".
- C-D Line passes in village Singhali and passes along the southern boundary of plot numbers 270, 307, 311, 310, 313, 316, 322, 323, then passes through plot number 330 and meets at point "D".
- D-A Line passes in village Jawali through plot numbers 192, 193, 190, then western boundary of plot numbers 11, 129, 116, 133, 125, 104, 12, 13, 11 and meets at the starting point "A".

[No. 43015/3/2005/PRIW]

M. SHAHABUDEEN, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4413.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 6 मई, 2006 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1732 तारीख 2 मई, 2006 का निम्नलिखित रूप से संशोधन करती है, अर्थात:-

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 में, "12/30 एफ ब्लॉक, मार्क रेसिडेन्सी, वी.ओ.सी रोड, कन्टोन्मेंट, त्रिची-620001(तमिलनाडु)", शब्दों और अंकों के स्थान पर, "न०. 10, थिरु - वि - का स्ट्रीट, राजाजीपुरम, तिरुवल्लूर - 602001 (तमिलनाडु)", शब्द और अंक रखे जाएंगे।

[फा. सं. आर-25011/7/2004-ओ आर-1]
एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas

New Delhi, the 10th November, 2006

S.O. 4413.— In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 1732, dated the 2nd May, 2006, published in the Gazette of India dated the 6th May, 2006, as follows, namely :-

In the said notification, in the Schedule, under column 1, for the words and numbers, "12/30, F Block, Mark Residency, VOC Road, Cantonment, Trichy - 620001 (Tamilnadu)", the words and numbers, "No.10, Thiru - Vi - Ka Street, Rajajipuram, Tiruvallur - 602 001 (Tamilnadu)", shall be substituted.

[F. No. R-25011/7/2004-O.R.-1]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4414.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनालि कि रिफ़ैनेरी से मीनाम्बक्कम एयरपोर्ट तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए एवीएशन टर्बाइन फ्युयल (ए टि एफ) पाइपलाइन परियोजना के कार्यन्वयन हेतु इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधिन भारत के राजपत्र से यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्किस दिन के भितर उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबध में श्री जी. जयराज, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, ए.टि.एफ. और चेन्नई-बैंगलोर पाइपलाइन परियोजना, सं 10, तिरु-भि-का स्ट्रिट, राजाजिपुरम, तिरुवालुर, तामिलनाडु-602 001 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

अनुसूची

तालूका : श्रीपेरुम्बुदूर	जिला : कांचीपुरम		राज्य : तामिलनाडु		
			क्षेत्रफल		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं-खण्ड सं	उप-खण्ड सं.	हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
53, वलारपुरम	427	अ	0	1	66
	437	1	0	11	05
	437	2	0	12	24
	437	3	0	3	92
	438	-	0	0	66
	439	1अ	0	0	40
	435	4	0	5	59
	435	5	0	0	50
	440	1	0	7	89
	440	2	0	3	98
	440	6	0	8	28
	440	7	0	10	15
	445	6	0	2	27
	445	7	0	4	62
	444	1	0	12	40
	444	2अ1अ	0	3	59
	444	16	0	1	69
57, इरुनाट्टुकोट्टाट्ट	1	2	0	28	36
	6	5	0	12	37
	2	4	0	0	40
	5	1	0	3	75
	5	2	0	10	32
	5	3	0	6	27
	5	5	0	12	27
	13	1	0	3	19
	14	1	0	0	90

1	2	3	4	5	6
	14	2अ	0	13	59
	14	2ब	0	1	90
	14	3	0	23	47
	15	8	0	10	14
	11	2अ1अ	0	8	19
	11	10	0	0	90
	11	5	0	2	88
	11	14	0	0	91
	11	8	0	1	50
	11	13	0	0	40
	22	2	0	7	29
	57	12अ	0	3	16
	57	12ब	0	10	36
	57	13	0	0	76
	57	10	0	0	81
	57	14	0	13	31
	57	6	0	0	65
	56	2	0	3	22
	56	3	0	15	69
	201	4	0	0	40
	210	14अ	0	0	40
	211	9	0	0	40
	199	8	0	0	91
	198	7	0	16	24
	218	2	0	0	40
	218	3	0	1	05
	218	7	0	4	50
	218	8अ1अ	0	1	08
	218	11	0	1	00
	218	8अ1क	0	0	40
	218	8अ3	0	0	40
	219	1अ1	0	6	74
	219	1अ2	0	0	45
	186	3अ1	0	4	05
	186	3अ3	0	4	61
	186	3ब	0	0	81
	186	3क	0	0	54
	348	8	0	1	35
	348	9	0	4	60
	348	10	0	2	16
	348	11	0	1	98
	348	13	0	2	88
	347	2	0	2	61
	347	4	0	3	75
	347	8	0	10	25
	347	9	0	3	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
	354	1	0	1	35
	354	6	0	1	12
	354	7	0	2	10
	354	8	0	0	40
	354	11	0	4	75
	354	10	0	0	40
	354	12	0	5	25
	354	14	0	2	12
	355	12	0	0	86
	355	13अ	0	0	40
	355	13ब	0	0	40
	356	16	0	1	62
	356	17	0	2	80
	356	21	0	0	60
	357	2	0	2	22
	357	3अ	0	2	00
	357	4	0	5	20
	357	5	0	3	60
	357	7	0	5	94
	357	8	0	0	40
	357	9	0	3	24
56, काटरम्बकम	25	1	0	0	40
	25	2	0	4	67
	25	3क1	0	3	60
	20	1	0	0	98
	24	1	0	3	04
	24	2	0	4	53
	24	3	0	4	93
	23	-	0	13	18
	29	-	0	11	30
	31	1	0	0	75
	40	2	0	9	37
	40	3	0	3	51
	40	5	0	1	72
	40	6	0	11	53
	51	2	0	12	80
	50	2	0	13	09
	49	1	0	6	23
	49	2	0	3	80
	54	1	0	0	81
	54	2	0	22	58
	48	1	0	11	28
	47	1	0	0	55
	47	2	0	11	07
	55	1	0	44	24
	55	2	0	2	74

1	2	3	4	5	6
	55	3	0	3	79
	109	1	0	6	66
	109	2	0	6	72
	118	2	0	13	16
	121	3	0	0	72
	121	5	0	0	47
	121	6	0	1	73
	121	7	0	2	24
	121	8	0	2	44
	121	9	0	2	74
	121	12अ	0	0	40
	121	13अ	0	0	40
	121	13क	0	0	40
	129	1	0	12	84
	183	1	0	0	80
	183	2	0	3	83
	183	3	0	3	78
	184	5	0	5	78
	184	6क	0	1	37
	184	6ड	0	1	80
	181	1अ	0	1	56
	181	1ब	0	0	40
	181	2अ	0	1	68
	181	2ब	0	2	42
	181	2क	0	2	18
	181	3	0	6	84
	192	4	0	7	43
	193	1अ	0	1	48
	193	1ब	0	3	15
	193	2	0	7	59
	175	1ब	0	0	40
	196	2अ	0	8	70
	197	-	0	2	70
	199	2	0	1	68
	198	1अ	0	0	40
	198	2अ	0	8	46
	207	3अ	0	0	47
	207	3क	0	4	75
	207	4	0	7	74
	209	1अ	0	8	73
	209	1ब	0	1	17
	209	5अ	0	5	03

1	2	3	4	5	6
	211	1अ1	0	9	38
	211	1अ2	0	1	82
	216	3अ1अ	0	3	41
	216	3अ1ब	0	0	40
	216	12	0	2	13
	216	3ब1	0	4	40
	216	4	0	1	08
	216	5	0	1	38
	216	3ब2	0	5	91
	217	1अ1	0	9	98
	217	2	0	0	96
	290	1अ1अ	0	6	22
	290	1ब	0	0	63
	290	1क	0	2	16
	290	1ड	0	1	56
	290	1इ	0	1	71
	290	2	0	5	24
	288	1अ1	0	1	00
	333	1	0	8	35
	333	2	0	7	83
	332	-	0	0	40
	334	1व	0	0	95
	334	1अ5	0	0	83
	334	1अ6	0	2	00
	334	1अ7	0	2	00
	334	1अ8	0	1	30
	334	1अ9	0	1	10
	334	1अ10	0	0	75
	334	1अ11	0	0	40
	334	1अ12	0	0	40
	334	1अ15	0	1	30
	334	1अ14	0	1	50
	334	1अ1क	0	0	40
	334	1अ4	0	0	65
	334	1अ16	0	1	43
	334	1अ17	0	0	40
	334	1ड	0	0	81
	334	1अ1अ	0	8	82
	338	1अ1	0	4	90
	338	1क	0	1	30
	338	1ब	0	1	62
	338	14	0	0	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	338	15	0	0	90
	338	21	0	1	32
	338	37	0	1	35
	338	22	0	3	00
	338	1अ2	0	0	40
	338	47	0	0	40
	338	48	0	0	90
	338	1अ क	0	1	17
	338	1अ ड	0	0	81
	338	1अ इ	0	0	54
	338	40	0	0	40
	335	11	0	0	40
	335	1एल्	0	0	40
	335	24	0	0	40
	335	22	0	0	45
	335	1जे	0	0	72
	335	1के	0	0	90
	335	8	0	1	22
	335	9	0	1	62
	335	20	0	0	40
	335	10	0	1	42
	335	21	0	0	40
	335	30	0	1	08
	335	1अ5	0	1	08
	335	1	0	7	41
	335	1अ4	0	0	51
	329	52	0	0	81
	329	51	0	0	57
	329	28	0	1	33
	329	29	0	1	67
	329	30	0	1	15
	329	31	0	0	76
	329	27	0	0	40
	329	26	0	0	44
	329	25	0	0	72
	329	24	0	0	47
	329	55	0	3	75
	328	67	0	0	40
	328	58	0	1	43
	328	26	0	1	59
	328	27	0	1	28
	328	25	0	0	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	328	24	0	0	50
	328	1जे	0	0	92
	328	57	0	0	86
	328	56	0	1	22
	328	59	0	0	56
	328	1अइ	0	1	57
	328	35	0	0	40
	328	54	0	1	52
	328	23	0	1	15
	328	22	0	0	79
	328	1एए	0	0	41
	328	1जी	0	0	40
	328	1एफ	0	0	40
	328	50	0	0	70
	328	21	0	0	40
	328	5	0	1	07
	328	51	0	3	01
	328	52	0	1	59
	328	18	0	0	40
	328	19	0	0	78
	328	1अ	0	5	12
60, बुद्धावर	106	1एए	0	13	50
	107	-	0	16	51
	108	1क	0	2	05
	108	1ड	0	7	70
	108	2	0	4	87
	59	6	0	0	40
	59	7	0	4	94
	59	21	0	4	81
	59	22	0	2	15
	59	25	0	6	84
	59	24	0	0	40
	59	39	0	0	40
	59	38	0	1	14
	59	35	0	3	10
	59	37	0	2	13
	59	1ब	0	3	06
	59	1क	0	3	24
	59	3	0	0	40
	59	4	0	0	80
	54	1	0	7	65

1	2	3	4	5	6
	54	2ब	0	3	94
	54	2क	0	4	00
	54	2अ	0	2	71
	54	3अ	0	0	53
	53	1अ	0	13	45
	53	1ब	0	1	40
	53	2	0	0	44
	52	8अ	0	0	89
	52	8ब	0	3	09
	52	9ब	0	3	14
	52	9क	0	3	01
	52	10	0	6	75
	52	11	0	6	89
	52	12अ	0	2	83
	52	12ब	0	2	86
	52	13अ	0	3	54
	52	13ब	0	2	48
	50	6ब	0	0	90
	50	6क	0	3	99
	50	6ड	0	2	48
	49	1क	0	2	16
	49	2ब1अ	0	15	02
	49	2ब1ब	0	1	37
	49	4	0	1	76
	49	5	0	1	71
	49	2ब4	0	1	38
	49	6	0	0	40
61, नन्दाम्बकम	640	3	0	0	40
	659	10	0	9	81
	641	6	0	16	20
	641	2	0	7	63
	641	3	0	21	36
	657	1अ1	0	35	26
	657	1अ2	0	2	00
	657	16	0	0	72
	657	17	0	2	20
	657	20	0	1	50
	657	1इ	0	2	16
	656	1अ1अ	0	6	17
	656	2	0	3	78
	647	10अ2	0	2	89

1	2	3	4	5	6
	647	10अ1	0	1	90
	647	9	0	4	64
	647	8अ	0	0	92
	647	8ब	0	3	56
	647	7ब	0	0	40
	647	7अ1अ	0	3	94
	647	6ब	0	0	40
	647	5अ1	0	8	04
	647	4अ1	0	4	18
	647	3अ	0	4	18
	647	2	0	3	41
	647	1ब	0	1	82
	647	1अ	0	2	46
	648	10अ1	0	8	12
	649	2	0	8	55
	649	6	0	9	38
	635	1अ	0	0	40
	635	1ब	0	7	55
	635	24	0	1	80
	635	25	0	0	92
	635	22	0	0	40
	635	17	0	0	40
	635	18	0	1	94
	635	16	0	0	40
	635	21	0	5	52
	635	19	0	1	08
	635	20	0	1	08
	635	32	0	0	40
	635	7	0	0	81
	635	8	0	1	08
	635	9	0	1	08
	635	10	0	1	56
	635	11	0	0	40
	635	12	0	1	20
	635	2ब5	0	0	40
	635	2ब4	0	0	68
	635	2ब3	0	2	68
	635	2ब2	0	0	87
	635	2क1	0	1	70
	633	1अ4	0	5	77
	633	1ब	0	3	30
	505	7ब	0	0	54

1	2	3	4	5	6
	501	1	0	3	16
	503	1	0	11	06
	502	1	0	0	40
	495	2	0	0	40
	496	2अ	0	3	15
	496	2अ	0	12	25
	496	1अ	0	4	07
	497	2अ	0	3	06
	497	1अ	0	0	40
	497	1अ	0	2	95
	488	-	0	2	86
	491	11	0	0	62
	491	12	0	2	83
	491	14	0	1	65
	490	-	0	0	88
	489	1	0	8	06
	489	2	0	1	58
	466	-	0	8	80
	465	5	0	0	40
	462	3	0	5	21
	180	1	0	4	96
	180	2	0	5	78
	180	3अ	0	1	99
	180	3अ	0	1	10
	198	2	0	2	93
	201	1	0	4	60
	199	-	0	3	23
	200	1	0	2	49
	200	2	0	2	93
	203	1	0	5	54
	204	3	0	5	12
	205	1	0	5	77
	206	-	0	3	24
	207	1	0	0	40
	326	1	0	2	12
	326	2	0	0	96
	326	3	0	0	70
	327	9	0	0	40
	327	10	0	1	74
	327	6	0	2	10
	327	11	0	0	40
	327	2	0	0	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	327	3	0	0	72
	327	7	0	0	90
	327	4ब	0	1	50
	327	4अ	0	1	80
	328	10	0	0	40
	216	-	0	1	40
	325	1	0	2	18
	292	-	0	1	71
	293	1	0	1	28
	288	-	0	3	09
	223	1	0	8	80
	223	2	0	1	92
	229	3	0	1	90
	283	-	0	5	18
	232	1	0	0	40
	272	2	0	4	86
	272	1	0	1	78
	235	-	0	6	78
	273	2ब	0	0	53
	270	4	0	9	76
	239	2	0	3	71
	239	1	0	8	24
	240	2	0	0	40
	238	3	0	0	40
	242	-	0	8	70
	243	-	0	0	40
	244	-	0	11	50
	241	-	0	0	65
	246	2	0	2	41
	246	3	0	8	97
	247	1	0	8	17
	14	6अ	0	0	40
	11	-	0	6	77
	10	2	0	0	40
	12	2	0	5	48
	12	1	0	5	79
	5	5	0	4	27
	5	2अ	0	0	80
	5	2ब	0	0	40
	5	1अ	0	0	40
	6	2	0	3	84
	6	1	0	4	20

1	2	3	4	5	6
	8	-	0	7	58
97, पुन्हाडालाम	243	1	0	1	39
63, सिरुवालाम	147	-	0	11	50
	139	1	0	2	22
	139	2	0	5	32
	118	-	0	15	27
	116	-	0	5	03
	119	-	0	0	40
	120	-	0	14	51
	113	-	0	0	40
	124	-	0	12	54
	125	2	0	2	58
	96	-	0	19	76
	94	1	0	5	54
	88	2	0	5	28
	88	1	0	2	54
92, तिरुमुडिववकम	2	1	0	4	42
	1	2	0	9	55
	1	1	0	1	26
91, कुन्नातुर	995	1	0	0	90
	995	2अ	0	3	28
	994	1अ	0	0	99
	994	1ब	0	6	46
	989	1	0	1	52
	989	2	0	9	17
	990	1	0	0	90
	991	1ब	0	15	27
	991	2	0	5	11
	978	-	0	14	93
	974	-	0	15	50
	972	2अ1	0	13	14
	972	2ब1	0	1	82
	968	2अ	0	0	79
	968	2ब	0	3	47
	968	1अ1	0	0	80
	968	1अ2	0	11	13
	955	-	0	15	51
	935	1अ1	0	3	06

1	2	3	4	5	6
	935	1ब	0	2	22
	935	1क	0	1	11
	935	1इ	0	1	43
	935	1एफ	0	0	40
	937	2ब	0	0	40
	937	2अ1	0	6	24
	937	2अ2	0	0	63
	938	1अ	0	2	66
	938	2	0	4	18
	939	4अ	0	8	41
	906	1अ1	0	6	19
	906	1अ2	0	0	56
	906	1ब1	0	12	46
	906	1ब2	0	0	40
	906	1ब3	0	2	20
	906	2क	0	0	40
	889	-	0	15	00
	890	-	0	0	43
	888	-	0	14	58
	877	2	0	0	40
	878	2	0	12	42
	820	-	0	11	63
	821	-	0	7	89
	822	1	0	8	76
	822	2	0	2	93
	827	-	0	9	02
	823	2	0	4	55
	825	-	0	12	36
	824	1	0	5	40
	824	2	0	1	41
	824	3	0	0	40
	786	2	0	1	70
	787	-	0	0	40
	788	2	0	1	82
	781	-	0	2	40
	780	-	0	5	53
	779	1	0	18	85
	771	-	0	18	91
	770	-	0	2	95
	756	3	0	8	69
	756	2	0	2	19
	756	1अ1	0	78	74

1	2	3	4	5	6
	755	2	0	2	75
	601	1	0	7	88
	604	-	0	1	70
	606	1	0	8	47
	593	1	0	9	90
	593	2	0	2	79
	592	1	0	1	21
	592	2अ1	0	9	36
	577	1अ	0	13	01
	577	1ब	0	0	40
	569	2	0	8	90
	568	1अ	0	7	31
	560	-	0	7	20
	549	1अ9	0	1	84
	549	1वाइ	0	1	18
	549	1जेड	0	1	18
	549	3	0	0	40
	549	1अ1अ	0	28	29
	549	1पि	0	0	40
	549	1क्यु	0	1	43
	549	7	0	0	40
	549	41	0	0	40
	494	1अ	0	6	21
	494	1ब	0	1	94
	496	1अ	0	7	47
	497	1अ	0	6	64
	483	1ब	0	7	02
	484	1	0	10	84
	478	1	0	9	19
	468	1	0	7	32
	468	2	0	1	66
	462	2	0	11	29
	131	4	0	5	40
	130	-	0	0	50
	127	-	0	6	27
	126	-	0	0	40
	129	1क	0	8	82
	116	1	0	12	60
	117	1	0	4	30
	118	1	0	9	13
	111	3ब1	0	2	14
	111	3ब2	0	9	50

1	2	3	4	5	6
	110	1	0	5	27
	110	2	0	14	95
	108	3	0	1	54
	98	-	0	0	40
	10	2अ	0	0	40
	10	3	0	3	92
	11	2अ1	0	0	40
	11	2अ2	0	1	25
	11	2अ3	0	5	31
	11	2क	0	12	84
	11	2ब	0	9	54
	1379	3ब	0	11	60
	1379	4अ1	0	0	40
	1379	3अ	0	1	48
	1379	4अ3	0	4	85
	1379	4अ2	0	9	48
	1379	4अ4	0	8	05
	1379	6अ1	0	2	25
	18	8	0	6	84
82. रेन्डांकटलाइ	216	-	0	26	69
	215	1	0	10	49
	209	-	0	6	89
	208	-	0	1	78
	206	-	0	8	04
	205	1अ	0	3	06
	151	1	0	5	89
	146	-	0	0	40
	143	1	0	7	97
	142	-	0	5	03
	136	-	0	8	89
	135	2	0	5	03
	120	1ब	0	7	29
	120	2	0	9	36
	120	3	0	0	80
	119	-	0	5	98
	105	3	0	0	40
	118	-	0	4	00
	117	2	0	3	80
	117	1अ	0	1	18
	117	1ब	0	4	41
	121	1अ	0	3	22

1	2	3	4	5	6
	115	1	0	8	91
	115	3	0	0	40
81, ताराप्यक्कम	212	-	0	1	43
	211	1अ	0	12	53
	211	1ब	0	0	40
	211	2अ	0	4	36
	211	2अ2	0	2	11
	210	1अ	0	0	40
	210	1ब	0	6	3
	209	2	0	0	89
	208	-	0	6	64
	207	1	0	7	79
	207	2	0	11	52
	225	1अ	0	0	40
	225	1ब	0	1	35
	225	2	0	0	95
	225	3	0	1	47
	203	4	0	1	68
	203	5	0	0	75
	202	9	0	2	57
	202	10	0	3	98
	202	11	0	3	09
	202	12	0	1	71
	202	13	0	0	72
	226	1अ	0	4	30
	226	3	0	2	88
	226	1अ1	0	11	52
	226	1ब2	0	15	98
	236	2	0	2	49
	239	1	0	5	13
	239	2	0	8	13
	238	-	0	16	39
	240	1	0	12	40
	282	1	0	20	96
	280	4	0	0	80
	280	5	0	3	96
	279	4	0	19	80
	284	1	0	27	00
	269	1	0	5	63
	268	1	0	3	30
	267	1	0	6	68

1	2	3	4	5	6
	5	1	0	10	48
	1	1	0	7	17
	1	2	0	5	36
80, केरुगौप्पकम	613	1	0	8	55
	534	1	0	8	54
	534	2	0	8	47
	609	-	0	16	31
	611	-	0	0	40
	617	-	0	8	18
	607	1	0	0	52
	607	3	0	5	43
	620	1	0	7	90
	620	2	0	9	00
	625	2	0	0	81
	628	-	0	1	01
	629	-	0	15	37
	630	1		9	69
	646	-	0	14	76
	649	-	0	7	48
	650	-	0	14	87
	651	2	0	0	50
	653	-	0	5	89
	652	-	0	9	03
	657	1	0	9	26
	657	2	0	5	93
	656	1	0	14	94
	656	2	0	0	40
	694	1	0	7	23
	694	2	0	5	89
	697	-	0	15	96
	711	-	0	0	40
	712	1	0	7	65
	712	2	0	6	96
	714	-	0	7	74
	715	1	0	4	76
	715	2	0	1	57
	719	-	0	0	68
	718	2	0	9	54
	722	-	0	15	12
	726	-	0	9	68
	724	1	0	1	07

1	2	3	4	5	6
	725	1	0	10	26
79, कोलाप्पक्कम	402	2	0	3	88
	403	1	0	25	16
	403	2ब	0	2	80
	348	1	0	5	67
	348	2अ	0	2	60
	348	2ब2	0	9	94
	348	2क	0	8	37
	346	1अ	0	10	79
	346	1ब	0	8	44
	349	4	0	4	39
	350	2	0	21	59
	351	1	0	11	34
	345	2	0	0	40
	343	1अ	0	3	20
	343	1ब	0	8	91
	352	3	0	4	05
	342	-	0	16	33
	339	1	0	13	76
	339	2	0	12	24
	338	-	0	15	98
	337	2	0	7	36
	337	1	0	1	97
	336	2क	0	5	44
	336	2अ	0	5	56
	336	2ब	0	5	28
	336	2ड	0	1	00
	333	2ब	0	3	00
	333	2अ	0	0	40
	333	2क	0	1	13
	331	2अ	0	31	86
	331	1	0	28	26
	323	1	0	23	58
	323	2	0	1	98
	323	3	0	8	64
	321	2अ	0	1	32
	322	1क	0	5	00
	322	2	0	2	00

[फा. सं. आर-25011/11/2006-ओ आर-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 13th November, 2006

S. O. 4414.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of Aviation Turbine Fuel (ATF) petroleum product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, Manali to Meenammbakkam Airport in the State of Tamil Nadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein, or laying of pipeline under the land to Shri G. Jayaraj, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, ATF & Chennai-Bangalore Pipeline Project, No. 10, Thiru-Vi-Ka Street, Rajajipuram, Tiruvallur, Tamilnadu-602 001.

SCHEDULE

Taluk: SRIPERUMBUDUR	District: KANCHEEPURAM		State: TAMILNADU		
			Area		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Subdivision No.	Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
53, Valarpuram	427	A	0	1	66
	437	1	0	11	05
	437	2	0	12	24
	437	3	0	3	92
	438	-	0	0	66

1	2	3	4	5	6
	439	1A	0	0	40
	435	4	0	5	59
	435	5	0	0	50
	440	1	0	7	89
	440	2	0	3	98
	440	6	0	8	28
	440	7	0	10	15
	445	6	0	2	27
	445	7	0	4	62
	444	1	0	12	40
	444	2A1A	0	3	59
	444	16	0	1	69
57, Irrungattukottai	1	2	0	28	36
	6	5	0	12	37
	2	4	0	0	40
	5	1	0	3	75
	5	2	0	10	32
	5	3	0	6	27
	5	5	0	12	27
	13	1	0	3	19
	14	1	0	0	90
	14	2A	0	13	59
	14	2B	0	1	90
	14	3	0	23	47
	15	8	0	10	14
	11	2A1A	0	8	19
	11	10	0	0	90
	11	5	0	2	88
	11	14	0	0	91
	11	8	0	1	50
	11	13	0	0	40
	22	2	0	7	29
	57	12A	0	3	16
	57	12B	0	10	36
	57	13	0	0	76
	57	10	0	0	81
	57	14	0	13	31
	57	6	0	0	65
	56	2	0	3	22
	56	3	0	15	69
	201	4	0	0	40
	210	14A	0	0	40
	211	9	0	0	40
	199	8	0	0	91
	198	7	0	16	24
	218	2	0	0	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	218	3	0	1	05
	218	7	0	4	50
	218	8A1A	0	1	08
	218	11	0	1	00
	218	8A1C	0	0	40
	218	8A3	0	0	40
	219	1A1	0	6	74
	219	1A2	0	0	45
	186	3A1	0	4	05
	186	3A3	0	4	61
	186	3B	0	0	81
	186	3C	0	0	54
	348	8	0	1	35
	348	9	0	4	60
	348	10	0	2	16
	348	11	0	1	98
	348	13	0	2	88
	347	2	0	2	61
	347	4	0	3	75
	347	8	0	10	25
	347	9	0	3	43
	354	1	0	1	35
	354	6	0	1	12
	354	7	0	2	10
	354	8	0	0	40
	354	11	0	4	75
	354	10	0	0	40
	354	12	0	5	25
	354	14	0	2	12
	355	12	0	0	86
	355	13A	0	0	40
	355	13B	0	0	40
	356	16	0	1	62
	356	17	0	2	80
	356	21	0	0	60
	357	2	0	2	22
	357	3A	0	2	00
	357	4	0	5	20
	357	5	0	3	60
	357	7	0	5	94
	357	8	0	0	40
	357	9	0	3	24
56, Katrambakkam	25	1	0	0	40
	25	2	0	4	67
	25	3C1	0	3	60
	20	1	0	0	96

1	2	3	4	5	6
	24	1	0	3	04
	24	2	0	4	53
	24	3	0	4	93
	23	-	0	13	18
	29	-	0	11	30
	31	1	0	0	75
	40	2	0	9	37
	40	3	0	3	51
	40	5	0	1	72
	40	6	0	11	53
	51	2	0	12	80
	50	2	0	13	09
	49	1	0	6	23
	49	2	0	3	80
	54	1	0	0	81
	54	2	0	2	58
	48	1	0	1	28
	47	1	0	0	55
	47	2	0	1	07
	55	1	0	4	24
	55	2	0	2	74
	55	3	0	3	79
	109	1	0	6	66
	109	2	0	6	72
	118	2	0	13	16
	121	3	0	0	72
	121	5	0	0	47
	121	6	0	1	73
	121	7	0	2	24
	121	8	0	2	44
	121	9	0	2	74
	121	12A	0	0	40
	121	13A	0	0	40
	121	13C	0	0	40
	129	1	0	12	84
	183	1	0	0	80
	183	2	0	3	83
	183	3	0	3	78
	184	5	0	5	78
	184	6C	0	1	37
	184	6D	0	1	80
	181	1A	0	1	56
	181	1B	0	0	40
	181	2A	0	1	68
	181	2B	0	2	42
	181	2C	0	2	18
	181	3	0	6	84

1	2	3	4	5	6
	192	4	0	7	43
	193	1A	0	1	48
	193	1B	0	3	15
	193	2	0	7	59
	175	1B	0	0	40
	196	2A	0	8	70
	197	-	0	2	70
	199	2	0	1	68
	198	1A	0	0	40
	198	2A	0	8	46
	207	3A	0	0	47
	207	3C	0	4	75
	207	4	0	7	74
	209	1A	0	8	73
	209	1B	0	1	17
	209	5A	0	5	03
	211	1A1	0	9	38
	211	1A2	0	1	82
	216	3A1A	0	3	41
	216	3A1B	0	0	40
	216	12	0	2	13
	216	3B1	0	4	40
	216	4	0	1	08
	216	5	0	1	38
	216	3B2	0	5	91
	217	1A1	0	9	98
	217	2	0	0	96
	290	1A1A	0	6	22
	290	1B	0	0	63
	290	1C	0	2	16
	290	1D	0	1	56
	290	1E	0	1	71
	290	2	0	5	24
	288	1A1	0	1	00
	333	1	0	8	35
	333	2	0	7	83
	332	-	0	0	40
	334	1B	0	0	95
	334	1A5	0	0	83
	334	1A6	0	2	00
	334	1A7	0	2	00
	334	1A8	0	1	30
	334	1A9	0	1	10
	334	1A10	0	0	75
	334	1A11	0	0	40
	334	1A12	0	0	40
	334	1A15	0	1	30

1	2	3	4	5	6
	334	1A14	0	1	50
	334	1A1C	0	0	40
	334	1A4	0	0	65
	334	1A16	0	1	43
	334	1A17	0	0	40
	334	1D	0	0	81
	334	1A1A	0	8	82
	338	1A1	0	4	90
	338	1C	0	1	30
	338	1B	0	1	62
	338	14	0	0	40
	338	15	0	0	90
	338	21	0	1	32
	338	37	0	1	35
	338	22	0	3	00
	338	1A2	0	0	40
	338	47	0	0	40
	338	48	0	0	90
	338	1AC	0	1	17
	338	1AD	0	0	81
	338	1AE	0	0	54
	338	40	0	0	40
	335	11	0	0	40
	335	1L	0	0	40
	335	24	0	0	40
	335	22	0	0	45
	335	1J	0	0	72
	335	1K	0	0	90
	335	8	0	1	22
	335	9	0	1	62
	335	20	0	0	40
	335	10	0	1	42
	335	21	0	0	40
	335	30	0	1	08
	335	1A5	0	1	08
	335	1	0	7	41
	335	1A4	0	0	51
	329	52	0	0	81
	329	51	0	0	57
	329	28	0	1	33
	329	29	0	1	67
	329	30	0	1	15
	329	31	0	0	76
	329	27	0	0	40
	329	26	0	0	44
	329	25	0	0	72
	329	24	0	0	47
	329	55	0	3	75

1	2	3	4	5	6
	328	67	0	0	40
	328	58	0	1	43
	328	26	0	1	59
	328	27	0	1	28
	328	25	0	0	40
	328	24	0	0	50
	328	1J	0	0	92
	328	57	0	0	86
	328	56	0	1	22
	328	59	0	0	56
	328	1I	0	1	57
	328	35	0	0	40
	328	54	0	1	52
	328	23	0	1	15
	328	22	0	0	79
	328	1H	0	0	41
	328	1G	0	0	40
	328	1F	0	0	40
	328	50	0	0	70
	328	21	0	0	40
	328	5	0	1	07
	328	51	0	3	01
	328	52	0	1	59
	328	18	0	0	40
	328	19	0	0	78
	328	1A	0	5	12
60, Puduppair	106	1M	0	13	50
	107	-	0	16	51
	108	1C	0	2	05
	108	1D	0	7	70
	108	2	0	4	87
	59	6	0	0	40
	59	7	0	4	94
	59	21	0	4	81
	59	22	0	2	15
	59	25	0	6	84
	59	24	0	0	40
	59	39	0	0	40
	59	38	0	1	14
	59	35	0	3	10
	59	37	0	2	13
	59	1B	0	3	06
	59	1C	0	3	24
	59	3	0	0	40
	59	4	0	0	80
	54	1	0	7	65

1	2	3	4	5	6
	54	2B	0	3	94
	54	2C	0	4	00
	54	2A	0	2	71
	54	3A	0	0	53
	53	1A	0	13	45
	53	1B	0	1	40
	53	2	0	0	44
	52	8A	0	0	89
	52	8B	0	3	09
	52	9B	0	3	14
	52	9C	0	3	01
	52	10	0	6	75
	52	11	0	6	89
	52	12A	0	2	83
	52	12B	0	2	86
	52	13A	0	3	54
	52	13B	0	2	48
	50	6B	0	0	90
	50	6C	0	3	99
	50	6D	0	2	48
	49	1C	0	2	16
	49	2B1A	0	15	02
	49	2B1B	0	1	37
	49	4	0	1	76
	49	5	0	1	71
	49	2B4	0	1	38
	49	6	0	0	40
61, Nandambakkam	640	3	0	0	40
	659	10	0	9	81
	641	6	0	16	20
	641	2	0	7	63
	641	3	0	21	36
	657	1A1	0	35	26
	657	1A2	0	2	00
	657	16	0	0	72
	657	17	0	2	20
	657	20	0	1	50
	657	1E	0	2	16
	656	1A1A	0	6	17
	656	2	0	3	78
	647	10A2	0	2	89

1	2	3	4	5	6
	647	10A1	0	1	90
	647	9	0	4	64
	647	8A	0	0	92
	647	8B	0	3	56
	647	7B	0	0	40
	647	7A1A	0	3	94
	647	6B	0	0	40
	647	5A1	0	8	04
	647	4A1	0	4	18
	647	3A	0	4	18
	647	2	0	3	41
	647	1B	0	1	82
	647	1A	0	2	46
	648	10B1	0	8	12
	649	2	0	8	55
	649	6	0	9	38
	635	1A	0	0	40
	635	1B	0	7	55
	635	24	0	1	80
	635	25	0	0	92
	635	22	0	0	40
	635	17	0	0	40
	635	18	0	1	94
	635	16	0	0	40
	635	21	0	5	52
	635	19	0	1	08
	635	20	0	1	08
	635	32	0	0	40
	635	7	0	0	81
	635	8	0	1	08
	635	9	0	1	08
	635	10	0	1	56
	635	11	0	0	40
	635	12	0	1	20
	635	2B5	0	0	40
	635	2B4	0	0	68
	635	2B3	0	2	68
	635	2B2	0	0	87
	635	2C1	0	1	70
	633	1A4	0	5	77
	633	1B	0	3	30
	505	7B	0	0	54

1	2	3	4	5	6
	501	1	0	3	16
	503	1	0	11	06
	502	1	0	0	40
	495	2	0	0	40
	496	2B	0	3	15
	496	2A	0	12	25
	496	1B	0	4	07
	497	2A	0	3	06
	497	1A	0	0	40
	497	1B	0	2	95
	488	-	0	2	86
	491	11	0	0	62
	491	12	0	2	83
	491	14	0	1	65
	490	-	0	0	88
	489	1	0	8	06
	489	2	0	1	58
	466	-	0	8	80
	465	5	0	0	40
	462	3	0	5	21
	180	1	0	4	96
	180	2	0	5	78
	180	3A	0	1	99
	180	3B	0	1	10
	198	2	0	2	93
	201	1	0	4	60
	199	-	0	3	23
	200	1	0	2	49
	200	2	0	2	93
	203	1	0	5	54
	204	3	0	5	12
	205	1	0	5	77
	206	-	0	3	24
	207	1	0	0	40
	326	1	0	2	12
	326	2	0	0	96
	326	3	0	0	70
	327	9	0	0	40
	327	10	0	1	74
	327	6	0	2	10
	327	11	0	0	40
	327	2	0	0	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	327	3	0	0	72
	327	7	0	0	90
	327	4B	0	1	50
	327	4A	0	1	80
	328	10	0	0	40
	216	-	0	1	40
	325	1	0	2	18
	292	-	0	1	71
	293	1	0	1	28
	288	-	0	3	09
	223	1	0	8	80
	223	2	0	1	92
	229	3	0	1	90
	283	-	0	5	18
	232	1	0	0	40
	272	2	0	4	86
	272	1	0	1	78
	235	-	0	6	78
	273	2B	0	0	53
	270	4	0	9	76
	239	2	0	3	71
	239	1	0	8	24
	240	2	0	0	40
	238	3	0	0	40
	242	-	0	8	70
	243	-	0	0	40
	244	-	0	11	50
	241	-	0	0	65
	246	2	0	2	41
	246	3	0	8	97
	247	1	0	8	17
	14	6A	0	0	40
	11	-	0	6	77
	10	2	0	0	40
	12	2	0	5	48
	12	1	0	5	79
	5	5	0	4	27
	5	2A	0	0	80
	5	2B	0	0	40
	5	1A	0	0	40
	6	2	0	3	84
	6	1	0	4	20

1	2	3	4	5	6
	8	-	0	7	58
97, Poonthandalam	243	1	0	1	39
63, Sirukalathur	147	-	0	11	50
	139	1	0	2	22
	139	2	0	5	32
	118	-	0	15	27
	116	-	0	5	03
	119	-	0	0	40
	120	-	0	14	51
	113	-	0	0	40
	124	-	0	12	54
	125	2	0	2	58
	96	-	0	19	76
	94	1	0	5	54
	88	2	0	5	28
	88	1	0	2	54
92, Thirumudivakkam	2	1	0	4	42
	1	2	0	9	55
	1	1	0	1	26
91, Kunnathur	995	1	0	0	90
	995	2A	0	3	28
	994	1A	0	0	99
	994	1B	0	6	46
	989	1	0	1	52
	989	2	0	9	17
	990	1	0	0	90
	991	1B	0	15	27
	991	2	0	5	11
	978	-	0	14	93
	974	-	0	15	50
	972	2A1	0	13	14
	972	2B1	0	1	82
	968	2A	0	0	79
	968	2B	0	3	47
	968	1A1	0	0	80
	968	1A2	0	11	13
	955	-	0	15	51
	935	1A1	0	3	06

1	2	3	4	5	6
	935	1B	0	2	22
	935	1C	0	1	11
	935	1E	0	1	43
	935	1F	0	0	40
	937	2B	0	0	40
	937	2A1	0	6	24
	937	2A2	0	0	63
	938	1A	0	2	66
	938	2	0	4	18
	939	4A	0	8	41
	906	1A1	0	6	19
	906	1A2	0	0	56
	906	1B1	0	12	46
	906	1B2	0	0	40
	906	1B3	0	2	20
	906	2C	0	0	40
	889	-	0	15	00
	890	-	0	0	43
	888	-	0	14	58
	877	2	0	0	40
	878	2	0	12	42
	820	-	0	11	63
	821	-	0	7	89
	822	1	0	8	76
	822	2	0	2	93
	827	-	0	9	02
	823	2	0	4	55
	825	-	0	12	36
	824	1	0	5	40
	824	2	0	1	41
	824	3	0	0	40
	786	2	0	1	70
	787	-	0	0	40
	788	2	0	1	82
	781	-	0	2	40
	780	-	0	5	53
	779	1	0	18	85
	771	-	0	18	91
	770	-	0	2	95
	756	3	0	8	69
	756	2	0	2	19
	756	1A1	0	78	74

1	2	3	4	5	6
	755	2	0	2	75
	601	1	0	7	88
	604	-	0	1	70
	606	1	0	8	47
	593	1	0	9	90
	593	2	0	2	79
	592	1	0	1	21
	592	2A1	0	9	36
	577	1A	0	13	01
	577	1B	0	0	40
	569	2	0	8	90
	568	1A	0	7	31
	560	-	0	7	20
	549	1A9	0	1	84
	549	1Y	0	1	18
	549	1Z	0	1	18
	549	3	0	0	40
	549	1A1A	0	28	29
	549	1P	0	0	40
	549	1Q	0	1	43
	549	7	0	0	40
	549	41	0	0	40
	494	1A	0	6	21
	494	1B	0	1	94
	496	1A	0	7	47
	497	1A	0	6	64
	483	1B	0	7	02
	484	1	0	10	84
	478	1	0	9	19
	468	1	0	7	32
	468	2	0	1	66
	462	2	0	11	29
	131	4	0	5	40
	130	-	0	0	50
	127	-	0	6	27
	126	-	0	0	40
	129	1C	0	8	82
	116	1	0	12	60
	117	1	0	4	30
	118	1	0	9	13
	111	3B1	0	2	14
	111	3B2	0	9	50

1	2	3	4	5	6
	110	1	0	5	27
	110	2	0	14	95
	108	3	0	1	54
	98	-	0	0	40
	10	2A	0	0	40
	10	3	0	3	92
	11	2A1	0	0	40
	11	2A2	0	1	25
	11	2A3	0	5	31
	11	2C	0	12	84
	11	2B	0	9	54
	1379	3B	0	11	60
	1379	4A1	0	0	40
	1379	3A	0	1	48
	1379	4A3	0	4	85
	1379	4A2	0	9	48
	1379	4A4	0	8	05
	1379	6A1	0	2	25
	18	8	0	6	84
82, Rendankattalai	216	-	0	26	69
	215	1	0	10	49
	209	-	0	6	89
	208	-	0	1	78
	206	-	0	8	04
	205	1A	0	3	06
	151	1	0	5	89
	146	-	0	0	40
	143	1	0	7	97
	142	-	0	5	03
	136	-	0	8	89
	135	2	0	5	03
	120	1B	0	7	29
	120	2	0	9	36
	120	3	0	0	80
	119	-	0	5	98
	105	3	0	0	40
	118	-	0	4	00
	117	2	0	3	80
	117	1A	0	1	18
	117	1B	0	4	41
	121	1A	0	3	22

1	2	3	4	5	6
	115	1	0	8	91
	115	3	0	0	40
81, Tharappakkam	212	-	0	1	43
	211	1A	0	12	53
	211	1B	0	0	40
	211	2A	0	4	36
	211	2B1	0	2	11
	210	1A	0	0	40
	210	1B	0	6	3
	209	2	0	0	89
	208	-	0	6	64
	207	1	0	7	79
	207	2	0	11	52
	225	1A	0	0	40
	225	1B	0	1	35
	225	2	0	0	95
	225	3	0	1	47
	203	4	0	1	68
	203	5	0	0	75
	202	6	0	2	57
	202	10	0	3	98
	202	11	0	3	09
	202	12	0	1	71
	202	13	0	0	72
	226	1A	0	4	30
	226	3	0	2	88
	226	1B1	0	11	52
	226	1B2	0	15	98
	236	2	0	2	49
	239	1	0	5	13
	239	2	0	8	13
	238	-	0	16	39
	240	1	0	12	40
	282	1	0	20	96
	280	4	0	0	80
	280	5	0	3	96
	279	4	0	19	80
	284	1	0	27	00
	269	1	0	5	63
	268	1	0	3	30
	267	1	0	6	68

1	2	3	4	5	6
	5	1	0	10	48
	1	1	0	7	17
	1	2	0	5	36
80, Kerugampakkam	613	1	0	8	55
	534	1	0	8	54
	534	2	0	8	47
	609	-	0	16	31
	611	-	0	0	40
	617	-	0	8	18
	607	1	0	0	52
	607	3	0	5	43
	620	1	0	7	90
	620	2	0	9	00
	625	2	0	0	81
	628	-	0	1	01
	629	-	0	15	37
	630	1		9	69
	646	-	0	14	76
	649	-	0	7	48
	650	-	0	14	87
	651	2	0	0	50
	653	-	0	5	89
	652	-	0	9	03
	657	1	0	9	26
	657	2	0	5	93
	656	1	0	14	94
	656	2	0	0	40
	694	1	0	7	23
	694	2	0	5	89
	697	-	0	15	96
	711	-	0	0	40
	712	1	0	7	65
	712	2	0	6	96
	714	-	0	7	74
	715	1C	0	4	76
	715	2	0	1	57
	719	-	0	0	68
	718	2	0	9	54
	722	-	0	15	12
	726	-	0	9	68
	724	1	0	1	07

1	2	3	4	5	6
	725	1	0	10	26
79, Kolappakkam	402	2	0	3	88
	403	1	0	25	16
	403	2B	0	2	80
	348	1	0	5	67
	348	2A	0	2	60
	348	2B2	0	9	94
	348	2C	0	8	37
	346	1A	0	10	79
	346	1B	0	8	44
	349	4	0	4	39
	350	2	0	21	59
	351	1	0	11	34
	345	2	0	0	40
	343	1A	0	3	20
	343	1B	0	8	91
	352	3	0	4	05
	342	-	0	16	33
	339	1	0	13	76
	339	2	0	12	24
	338	-	0	15	98
	337	2	0	7	36
	337	1	0	1	97
	336	2C	0	5	44
	336	2A	0	5	56
	336	2B	0	5	28
	336	2D	0	1	00
	333	2B	0	3	00
	333	2A	0	0	40
	333	2C	0	1	13
	331	2A	0	31	86
	331	1	0	28	26
	323	1	0	23	58
	323	2	0	1	98
	323	3	0	8	64
	321	2A	0	1	32
	322	1C	0	5	00
	322	2	0	2	00

[F. No. R-25011/11/2006-O.R.-i]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 14 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4415.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलायंस गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, पूर्ववत् मैसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड जिसका तत्पश्चात् पुनः नामकरण मैसर्स रिलायंस गैस पाइपलाइन्स लिमिटेड की संप्रवर्तक कंपनी मैसर्स रिलायंस इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के गोवा में उत्तरी/ दक्षिणी अपतट में खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्र प्रदेश में संरचनाओं से आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य में रंगारेड्डी जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स रिलायंस गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिये ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री पी. बुच्चारेड्डी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, रिलायंस गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, फ्लैट नं 501, डोर नं 6-3-1238/501, 5 फ्लोर, एलिगेंट अपार्टमेंट्स, राजभवन रोड, सोमाजीगुडा - 500082, हैदराबाद, आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

अनुसूची					
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	सब-डिविजन नंबर	आर ओ यू अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	एयर	सि एयर
1	2	3	4	5	6
मंडल : खुतुबुल्लापुर					
जि ला : रंगारेड्डी					
राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश					
1. दुण्डिगल	711	-	0	00	50
	712	-	0	51	50
	719	-	0	31	00
	722	-	0	23	00
	723	-	0	36	00
	740	-	0	03	00
	741	-	0	04	00
	742	-	0	04	00
	743	-	0	32	00
	746	-	0	59	00
	747	-	0	23	00

	2	3	4	5	6
751	-	0	22	00	
752	-	0	04	00	
753	-	0	00	50	
754	-	0	40	00	
755	-	0	08	50	
758	-	0	00	50	
871(पांड)	-	0	25	00	
973	-	0	00	25	
974	-	0	04	50	
बैल गाड़ी रस्ता	-	0	03	00	
(सर्वे नं.742&743 के बीच में)					
गाँव सीमा	-	0	12	50	
(सर्वे नं.972&974 के बीच में)					
बैल गाड़ी रस्ता	-	0	02	00	
(सर्वे नं.871&972 के बीच में)					

[फा. सं. एल-14014/4/2002-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th November, 2006

S. O. 4415.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from the exploration blocks in the Northern/Southern offshore of Goa and structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited by a Reliance Group company, M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited erstwhile M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited subsequently renamed as M/s Reliance Gas Pipelines Limited, to various consumers of District Rangareddy in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in lands under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962(50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri P. Butcha Reddy, Competent Authority, Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited, Plot No 501, Door No 6-3-1238/501, 5th Floor, Elegant Apartments, Raj Bhavan Road, Somajiguda- 500 082, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh State.

Schedule					
Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU		
			Hectare	Are	C-Are
1	2	3	4	5	6
Mandal : Qutbullapur		District : Rangareddy		State : Andhra Pradesh	
1. Dundigal	711	-	0	00	50
	712	-	0	51	50
	719	-	0	31	00
	722	-	0	23	00
	723	-	0	36	00
	740	-	0	03	00
	741	-	0	04	00
	742	-	0	04	00
	743	-	0	32	00
	746	-	0	59	00
	747	-	0	23	00
	751	-	0	22	00
	752	-	0	04	00
	753	-	0	00	50
	754	-	0	40	00
	755	-	0	08	50
	758	-	0	00	50
	871(Pond)	-	0	25	00
	973	-	0	00	25
	974	-	0	04	50
	Cart Road	-	0	03	00
	(Between Sy. Nos. 742&743)				
	Village Site	-	0	12	50
	(Near Sy. Nos. 972&974)				
	Cart Road	-	0	02	00
	(Between Sy. Nos. 871&972)				

[F. No. L-14014/4/2002-G.P.]
S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 2006

का. अ. 4416.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 1621 दिनांक 27.04.2006, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, दादरी (उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में) से पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य में) तक, प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "आर.-एल.एन.जी. स्पर पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील घरौड़ा जिला करनाल (हरियाणा राज्य) की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आषय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 30.05.2006 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : घरौंड़ा		जिला : करनाल		राज्य : हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. बेगमपुर	24		2176	0	10	62
			2178	0	08	09
			2181	0	08	34
			2182	0	08	60
			2183	0	07	84
			2187	0	07	84
			2186	0	08	09
			2191	0	00	50
			2188	0	01	26

[फा. सं. एल-14014/32/2006-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th November, 2006

S.O. 4416.-- Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 1621 dated the 27th April 2006, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Natural Gas from Dadri in the state of Uttar Pradesh to Panipat in the state of Haryana by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the "R-LNG Spur pipeline from Dadri to Panipat" in Tehsil Gharaunda, District Karnal, in Haryana State;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 30.05.2006.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, ~~has~~ submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : GHARAUNDA		District : KARNAL		State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. BEGAMPUR	24		2176	0	10	62
			2178	0	08	09
			2181	0	08	34
			2182	0	08	60
			2183	0	07	84
			2187	0	07	84
			2186	0	08	09
			2191	0	00	50
			2188	0	01	26

[F. No. L-14014/32/2006-G.P.]
S.B MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 2006

क्रा. 31/4417—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 1623 दिनांक 27.04.2006, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, दादरी (उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में) से पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य में) तक, प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "आर.-एल.एन.जी. स्पर पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील गन्नौर जिला सोनीपत (हरियाणा राज्य) की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आषय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 30.05.2006 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : गन्नौर		जिला : सोनीपत		राज्य : हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. पबनेरा	9	5/3		0	07	33
		5/2		0	61	73
		5/1		0	25	30
		5	3	0	11	89
			2	0	07	84
			1	0	03	28
		6	5	0	00	25
		4	23	0	00	50
			22	0	04	55
			21	0	09	10
		3	25	0	12	39
			24/1	0	09	36
			24/2	0	03	03
			23	0	12	39
			22/1	0	06	07
			22/2	0	06	07
			21	0	12	39
		2	25	0	12	39
			24	0	12	14
			17	0	00	25
			23/2	0	02	02
			18/2	0	11	63
			18/1	0	00	25
			19/1	0	00	25
			19/2	0	00	50
			19/3	0	00	25
2. चन्दौली	8	43	19/2	0	01	01
			19/1	0	04	55
			13	0	00	25
			12	0	08	09
			11	0	10	62
			10	0	04	30

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		42	6	0	12	90
			5/1	0	00	50
			5/2	0	00	25
			7	0	01	01
			4/2	0	13	91
			4/1	0	00	25
			3	0	03	28
		31	23	0	10	87
			22	0	09	86
			19	0	05	06
			20	0	14	16
			11/2	0	00	50
		32	16	0	01	01
			15	0	13	66
			14	0	06	57
			7/1	0	05	06
			7/2	0	03	28
			8/1	0	03	03
			8/2	0	01	01
			8/3	0	08	34
			3/3	0	00	50
			3/2	0	02	27
			9	0	00	25
			2/1	0	00	75
			2/2	0	14	92
			1	0	02	27
		21	21/1	0	01	26
			21/2	0	10	37
			21/3	0	00	50
			22	0	00	25
		20	25	0	05	31
			16/1	0	02	78
			16/2	0	05	81
			17/1	0	11	13
			17/2	0	00	25
			14	0	04	04

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13	0	14	42
			8	0	01	01
			12	0	01	01
			9	0	14	42
			10	0	04	55
			1	0	10	62
		19	5	0	09	61
		14	25	0	03	28
			24	0	11	63
			23	0	00	25
			17/1	0	00	25
			17/2	0	01	26
			18/1	0	01	01
			18/2	0	13	66
			19/1	0	02	02
			19/2	0	02	27
			12	0	13	15
			11/2	0	02	53
			9	0	00	25
			10/1	0	09	10
			10/2	0	05	31
			1	0	00	75
		15	5	0	14	67
			6	0	01	01
			4/22	0	00	25
		1	24/1	0	06	57
			24/2	0	02	27
			24/3	0	02	02
			24/4	0	00	75
			24/13	0	00	25
			24/11	0	00	50
			24/14	0	00	25
			24/12	0	00	25
			24/15	0	00	25
			24/16	0	00	25

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल			
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर	
3. बेगा	1	163	24/17	0	00	25	
			24/18	0	00	25	
			25	0	01	77	
			65	0	02	53	
			67	0	01	77	
			97	0	00	25	
			103	0	01	26	
			110	0	01	01	
			17	0	06	83	
			18/1	0	07	33	
			13/2	0	01	01	
			18/2	0	00	25	
			13/1	0	05	31	
			12	0	06	83	
			9	0	11	13	
			26	0	00	50	
			10	0	03	54	
			1	0	12	90	
			162	5	0	01	26
			155	21/1	0	00	25
			156	25/1	0	12	14
				25/2	0	01	26
				24/2	0	00	75
				16	0	00	75
				17/1	0	04	55
				17/2	0	10	37
				18	0	00	25
				14	0	02	02
				13/1	0	07	33
				13/2	0	02	02
				13/3	0	03	79
				8	0	05	31
				9	0	09	61
				2	0	08	85
				1/1	0	05	81

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		137	20	0	00	25
			21	0	11	63
		136	25	0	02	02
			16	0	14	42
			17	0	00	25
			15	0	02	27
			14	0	12	39
			7	0	07	33
			8	0	07	33
			3	0	11	63
		125	23/1	0	00	25
			22	0	14	67
			21/1	0	00	25
			21/2	0	00	25
			19	0	01	01
			20	0	13	91
			11/2	0	03	79
		126	15	0	11	38
			6/1	0	00	25
			6/2	0	07	59
			7/1	0	01	77
			7/2	0	05	56
			7/3	0	00	50
			4/1	0	07	59
			4/2	0	05	06
			3	0	02	27
		105	22/1	0	00	25
			24/2	0	00	25
			23/1	0	07	84
			23/2	0	06	83
			18/16	0	00	25
			18/17	0	00	25
			18/18	0	00	50
			18/19	0	00	50
			18/20	0	00	75

गाँव का नाम	इय्यासत संख्या	मुस्तसिमा संख्या	खसरा/ बिलत संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	कर्मिटर
			19/1	0	02	27
			19/2	0	00	75
			19/3	0	01	26
			19/4	0	02	53
			19/5	0	01	77
			19/6	0	00	75
			19/7	0	01	26
			19/8	0	02	27
			12/1	0	04	80
			12/2	0	00	75
			11/3/1	0	01	77
			11/3/2	0	02	27
			11/1	0	03	28
			11/2	0	00	50
			10	0	08	08
	104		6	0	05	31
			5	0	11	89
			4	0	02	02
	97		25/2	0	00	25
			24	0	15	18
			17	0	01	01
			23/2	0	00	75
			18	0	13	91
			13	0	04	55
			12/1	0	04	30
			12/2	0	06	07
			9	0	08	34
			10	0	06	83
			1	0	12	39
	98		5	0	02	53
	75		21	0	00	25
	74		25	0	14	67
			24	0	00	25
			16	0	01	77
			17	0	13	15
			14	0	05	56

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13	0	09	61
			8	0	09	86
			9/1	0	04	80
			9/2	0	00	50
			2/2	0	04	04
			2/1	0	08	09
		69	22/1	0	09	10
			21	0	03	03
			19/2	0	00	25
			20	0	08	34
			11/1	0	01	01
			11/2	0	09	10
			10	0	02	02
		70	15	0	00	50
			6	0	10	62
			5	0	12	39
		46	25	0	05	31
			24	0	05	81
			17/1	0	09	61
			17/2	0	02	78
			14	0	09	10
			7/2	0	00	25
			13/2	0	00	75
			8	0	10	87
			3	0	12	39
			2/1	0	00	25
		45	22	0	08	09
			19/2	0	09	61
			23	0	04	04
			12	0	01	51
			198	0	03	03
			199	0	02	27
			200	0	01	77
			552	0	05	06
			556	0	01	01
			570	0	00	25

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			581	0	01	51
			608	0	01	26
			610	0	01	01
			616	0	02	53
4. दातौली	7	56	19	0	02	27
			12	0	06	32
			11	0	05	56
			10	0	12	65
			1	0	09	10
		55	5	0	03	03
		34	21	0	00	05
		35	25	0	09	86
			24/1	0	00	25
			17	0	05	31
			134	0	01	77

[फा. सं. एल-14014/33/2006-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th November, 2006

S. O. 4417.— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 1623 dated the 27th April 2006, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Natural Gas from Dadri in the state of Uttar Pradesh to Panipat in the state of Haryana by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the "R-LNG Spur pipeline from Dadri to Panipat" in Tehsil **Ganaur**, District **Sonipat**, in **Haryana State**;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 30.05.2006.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : GANAUR		District : SONIPAT		State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. PABNERA	9	5/3		0	07	33
		5/2		0	61	73
		5/1		0	25	30
		5	3	0	11	89
			2	0	07	84
			1	0	03	28
		6	5	0	00	25
		4	23	0	00	50
			22	0	04	55
			21	0	09	10
		3	25	0	12	39
			24/1	0	09	36
			24/2	0	03	03
			23	0	12	39
			22/1	0	06	07
			22/2	0	06	07
			21	0	12	39
		2	25	0	12	39
			24	0	12	14
			17	0	00	25
			23/2	0	02	02
			18/2	0	11	63
			18/1	0	00	25
			19/1	0	00	25
			19/2	0	00	50
			19/3	0	00	25
2. CHANDLAULI	8	43	19/2	0	01	01
			19/1	0	04	55
			13	0	00	25
			12	0	08	09
			11	0	10	62
			10	0	04	30

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		42	6	0	12	90
			5/1	0	00	50
			5/2	0	00	25
			7	0	01	01
			4/2	0	13	91
			4/1	0	00	25
			3	0	03	28
		31	23	0	10	87
			22	0	09	86
			19	0	05	06
			20	0	14	16
			11/2	0	00	50
		32	16	0	01	01
			15	0	13	66
			14	0	06	57
			7/1	0	05	06
			7/2	0	03	28
			8/1	0	03	03
			8/2	0	01	01
			8/3	0	08	34
			3/3	0	00	50
			3/2	0	02	27
			9	0	00	25
			2/1	0	00	75
			2/2	0	14	92
			1	0	02	27
		21	21/1	0	01	26
			21/2	0	10	37
			21/3	0	00	50
			22	0	00	25
		20	25	0	05	51
			16/1	0	02	78
			16/2	0	05	81
			17/1	0	11	13
			17/2	0	00	25
			14	0	04	04

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13	0	14	42
			8	0	01	01
			12	0	01	01
			9	0	14	42
			10	0	04	55
			1	0	10	62
		19	5	0	09	61
		14	25	0	03	28
			24	0	11	63
			23	0	00	25
			17/1	0	00	25
			17/2	0	01	26
			18/1	0	01	01
			18/2	0	13	66
			19/1	0	02	02
			19/2	0	02	27
			12	0	13	15
			11/2	0	02	53
			9	0	00	25
			10/1	0	09	10
			10/2	0	05	31
			1	0	00	75
		15	5	0	14	67
			6	0	01	01
			4/22	0	00	25
		1	24/1	0	06	57
			24/2	0	02	27
			24/3	0	02	02
			24/4	0	00	75
			24/13	0	00	25
			24/11	0	00	50
			24/14	0	00	25
			24/12	0	00	25
			24/15	0	00	25
			24/16	0	00	25

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
3. BEGA	1	163	24/17	0	00	25
			24/18	0	00	25
			25	0	01	77
			65	0	02	53
			67	0	01	77
			97	0	00	25
			103	0	01	26
			110	0	01	01
			17	0	06	83
			18/1	0	07	33
			13/2	0	01	01
			18/2	0	00	25
			13/1	0	05	31
			12	0	06	83
			9	0	11	13
			26	0	00	50
			10	0	03	54
			1	0	12	90
		162	5	0	01	26
		155	21/1	0	00	25
		156	25/1	0	12	14
			25/2	0	01	26
			24/2	0	00	75
			16	0	00	75
			17/1	0	04	55
			17/2	0	10	37
			18	0	00	25
			14	0	02	02
			13/1	0	07	33
			13/2	0	02	02
			13/3	0	03	79
			8	0	05	31
			9	0	09	61
			2	0	08	85
			1/1	0	05	81

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		137	20	0	00	25
			21	0	11	63
		136	25	0	02	02
			16	0	14	42
			17	0	00	25
			15	0	02	27
			14	0	12	39
			7	0	07	33
			8	0	07	33
			3	0	11	63
		125	23/1	0	00	25
			22	0	14	67
			21/1	0	00	25
			21/2	0	00	25
			19	0	01	01
			20	0	13	91
			11/2	0	03	79
		126	15	0	11	38
			6/1	0	00	25
			6/2	0	07	59
			7/1	0	01	77
			7/2	0	05	56
			7/3	0	00	50
			4/1	0	07	59
			4/2	0	05	06
			3	0	02	27
		105	22/1	0	00	25
			24/2	0	00	25
			23/1	0	07	84
			23/2	0	06	83
			18/16	0	00	25
			18/17	0	00	25
			18/18	0	00	50
			18/19	0	00	50
			18/20	0	00	75

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			19/1	0	02	27
			19/2	0	00	75
			19/3	0	01	26
			19/4	0	02	53
			19/5	0	01	77
			19/6	0	00	75
			19/7	0	01	26
			19/8	0	02	27
			12/1	0	04	80
			12/2	0	00	75
			11/3/1	0	01	77
			11/3/2	0	02	27
			11/1	0	03	28
			11/2	0	00	50
			10	0	08	09
		104	6	0	05	31
			5	0	11	89
			4	0	02	02
		97	25/2	0	00	25
			24	0	15	18
			17	0	01	01
			23/2	0	00	75
			18	0	13	91
			13	0	04	55
			12/1	0	04	30
			12/2	0	06	07
			9	0	08	34
			10	0	06	83
			1	0	12	39
		98	5	0	02	53
		75	21	0	00	25
		74	25	0	14	67
			24	0	00	25
			16	0	01	77
			17	0	13	15
			14	0	05	56

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatl No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13	0	09	61
			8	0	09	86
			9/1	0	04	80
			9/2	0	00	50
			2/2	0	04	04
			2/1	0	08	09
		69	22/1	0	09	10
			21	0	03	03
			19/2	0	00	25
			20	0	08	34
			11/1	0	01	01
			11/2	0	09	10
			10	0	02	02
		70	15	0	00	50
			6	0	10	62
			5	0	12	39
		46	25	0	05	31
			24	0	05	81
			17/1	0	09	61
			17/2	0	02	78
			14	0	09	10
			7/2	0	00	25
			13/2	0	00	75
			8	0	10	87
			3	0	12	39
			2/1	0	00	25
		45	22	0	08	09
			19/2	0	09	61
			23	0	04	04
			12	0	01	51
			198	0	03	03
			199	0	02	27
			200	0	01	77
			552	0	05	06
			556	0	01	01
			570	0	00	25

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
4. DATAULI	7	56	581	0	01	51
			608	0	01	26
			610	0	01	01
			616	0	02	53
			19	0	02	27
			12	0	06	32
			11	0	05	56
			10	0	12	65
			1	0	09	10
		55	5	0	03	03
		34	21	0	00	25
		35	25	0	09	86
			24/1	0	00	25
			17	0	05	31
			134	0	01	77

[F. No. L-14014/33/2006-G.P.
S.B MANDAL, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 2006

क्रा. आ. 4418.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 1622 दिनांक 27.04.2006, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, दादरी (उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में) से पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य में) तक, प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "आर.-एल.एन.जी. स्पर पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील मतलौडा जिला पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य) की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने अन्वय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 30.05.2006 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : मतलौड़ा		जिला : पानीपत		राज्य : हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. शौदापुर	25	46	5/1	0	00	75
			5/2	0	05	31
			25	0	11	89
			24/1	0	00	25
			16/2	0	04	55
			17	0	07	59
			14	0	12	14
			7	0	11	63
			8	0	00	25
			4	0	03	54
		35	3	0	08	09
			23	0	12	14
			18	0	11	13
			19	0	01	26
			13	0	01	51
			12/1	0	02	53
			12/2	0	08	09
			9/1	0	01	26
			2	0	09	86
		22	22/2	0	01	77
			19/1	0	09	36
			12	0	11	13
			9	0	10	62
			2	0	08	34
		19	22	0	05	56
			23	0	04	04
			19	0	00	25
			18	0	11	38
			13/2	0	08	85

गौव का नाम			हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
						हेक्टेयर	एकर	वर्गमीटर
10	01	0	1		3/1/2	0	00	25
02	00	0	5/1/1		8/2	0	10	12
10	40	0	5/2		7/1	0	00	25
03	50	0	5/5/1/2		4/1	0	06	07
00	20	0	7/1/1/1		4/2	0	01	01
03	40	0	5/5/1/1		3/2/2	0	04	30
15	10	0	1/1/1/1		14	0	00	25
01	00	0	01	12	24	0	11	38
02	11	0	01		17	0	07	59
01	11	0	0		14	0	05	31
01	11	0	0		7	0	11	13
00	11	0	0		4	0	11	13
01	00	0	0		3	0	00	25
04	60	0	0	9	24	0	05	56
03	10	0	0		23	0	05	56
01	00	0	0		18	0	11	38
03	20	0	0		17	0	00	25
00	60	0	0		13	0	11	38
06	00	0	0		8	0	11	38
02	01	0	0		3	0	10	87
00	00	0	0	2	23	0	08	09
00	11	0	0		22	0	03	54
00	00	0	0		19	0	01	01
00	00	0	0		232/2	0	00	50
00	00	0	0		238	0	00	50
00	01	0	0		242	0	00	50
01	00	0	0		243	0	00	50
00	00	0	0		250/2	0	00	25
2. नौहरा	00	0	20	79	18	0	00	25
01	01	0	0		19	0	09	86
00	00	0	0		12	0	11	38
00	11	0	0		9	0	11	38
01	11	0	0					

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			2	0	10	62
			1/2/2	0	00	50
		74	22	0	04	04
			21/2/2	0	07	59
			20/1/1	0	05	56
			20/2/2	0	04	80
			11/1/1	0	01	77
		73	16	0	00	25
			15	0	11	38
			6	0	11	13
			5	0	11	13
		65	25	0	11	38
			24	0	00	25
			16	0	08	09
			17	0	03	03
			14	0	09	10
			15	0	02	27
			7	0	06	07
			6	0	03	54
			4/2	0	10	62
			4/1	0	00	50
		56	24	0	11	38
			17/1	0	05	57
			17/2	0	05	57
			14	0	10	62
			13	0	00	75
			7	0	05	56
			8	0	05	56
			3	0	10	12
			4/2	0	00	25
		47	23	0	11	38
			18	0	11	13

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13	0	10	62
			8/2	0	09	61
			9	0	00	25
			3	0	07	08
			2	0	04	04
		39	23	0	01	26
			22	0	10	12
			19	0	10	12
			12	0	11	38
			9	0	11	13
			2	0	11	38
		29	22	0	09	61
			21/1	0	01	51
			20/2/1	0	03	28
			20/2/2	0	00	75
			20/1	0	03	03
			19	0	04	04
			12/2	0	00	25
			11	0	09	10
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13
		22	21	0	10	37
			26	0	00	75
			20	0	11	13
			11/2	0	11	13
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13
		11	21	0	10	62
			20	0	11	13
			11	0	11	13
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल			
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर	
3. सिठाना	14	109	6	21	0	11	13
			20	0	11	38	
			95	0	02	53	
			101/2	0	01	77	
			121	0	00	50	
			388	0	02	02	
			393	0	01	01	
			417	0	01	01	
			16	0	10	12	
			15	0	11	13	
			6	0	11	13	
			5	0	11	13	
			97	25	0	11	13
			24	0	00	25	
	91	17	0	02	53		
		16	0	08	60		
		14	0	05	56		
		15	0	05	56		
		6	0	03	03		
		7	0	08	09		
		4	0	10	12		
		5	0	00	75		
		24	0	11	13		
		17/1	0	11	13		
		14	0	11	13		
		7	0	11	13		
		4	0	11	13		
		75	24	0	11	13	
		17	0	11	13		
		14	0	11	13		
		7	0	11	13		
		4	0	11	13		

गौव का नाम	हववस्ता संख्या	मुस्तातिल संख्या	खसस/किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		67	24	0	11	13
			17	0	14	16
			16/2	0	00	25
			14	0	01	77
			15/1	0	12	39
		68	2	0	00	25
		49	22	0	12	39
			19/2	0	10	87
			12	0	07	33
			9	0	11	13
			2	0	11	13
		42	22	0	11	13
			19	0	11	13
			12	0	11	13
			9	0	11	13
			22	0	11	13
		28	22	0	11	13
			19/2	0	10	12
			12	0	11	13
			10	0	00	25
			2	0	09	10
			1	0	02	02
		20	22/2	0	01	26
			21	0	04	55
			22/1	0	03	28
			20	0	09	61
			19	0	01	51
			11/2	0	11	13
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		7	21	0	11	13
			20	0	11	13
			11	0	11	38
			10	0	04	55
			130/2	0	04	04
			131	0	01	77
			134	0	01	51
			159	0	00	50

[फा. सं. एल-14014/34/2006-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th November, 2006

S. O. 4418.— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 1622 dated the 27th April 2006, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Natural Gas from Dadri in the state of Uttar Pradesh to Panipat in the state of Haryana by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the "R-LNG Spur pipeline from Dadri to Panipat" in Tehsil Madaluda, District Panipat, in Haryana State;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 30.05.2006.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : MADLAUDA		District : PANIPAT		State : HARYANA			
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area			
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre	
1. SHOHDAPUR	25	46	5/1	0	00	75	
			5/2	0	05	31	
			35	25	0	11	89
			24/1	0	00	25	
			16/2	0	04	55	
			17	0	07	59	
			14	0	12	14	
			7	0	11	63	
			8	0	00	25	
			4	0	03	54	
		32	3	0	08	09	
			23	0	12	14	
			18	0	11	13	
			19	0	01	26	
			13	0	01	51	
			12/1	0	02	53	
			12/2	0	08	09	
			9/1	0	01	26	
			2	0	09	86	
			22	22/2	0	01	77
		19/1		0	09	36	
		12		0	11	13	
		9		0	10	62	
		2		0	08	34	
		19		22	0	05	56
				23	0	04	04
				19	0	00	25
				18	0	11	38
				13/2	0	08	85

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			3/1/2	0	00	25
			8/2	0	10	12
			7/1	0	00	25
			4/1	0	06	07
			4/2	0	01	01
			3/2/2	0	04	30
			14	0	00	25
		12	24	0	11	38
			17	0	07	59
			14	0	05	31
			7	0	11	13
			4	0	11	13
			3	0	00	25
		9	24	0	05	56
			23	0	05	56
			18	0	11	38
			17	0	00	25
			13	0	11	38
			8	0	11	38
			3	0	10	87
		2	23	0	08	09
			22	0	03	54
			19	0	01	01
			232/2	0	00	50
			238	0	00	50
			242	0	00	50
			243	0	00	50
			250/2	0	00	25
2. NAUHRA	20	79	18	0	00	25
			19	0	09	86
			12	0	11	38
			9	0	11	38

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			2	0	10	62
			1/2/2	0	00	50
		74	22	0	04	04
			21/2/2	0	07	59
			20/1/1	0	05	56
			20/2/2	0	04	80
			11/1/1	0	01	77
		73	16	0	00	25
			15	0	11	38
			6	0	11	13
			5	0	11	13
		65	25	0	11	38
			24	0	00	25
			16	0	08	09
			17	0	03	03
			14	0	09	10
			15	0	02	27
			7	0	06	07
			6	0	03	54
			4/2	0	10	62
			4/1	0	00	50
		56	24	0	11	38
			17/1	0	05	57
			17/2	0	05	57
			14	0	10	62
			13	0	00	75
			7	0	05	56
			8	0	05	56
			3	0	10	12
			4/2	0	00	25
		47	23	0	11	38
			18	0	11	13

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13	0	10	62
			8/2	0	09	61
			9	0	00	25
			3	0	07	08
			2	0	04	04
		39	23	0	01	26
			22	0	10	12
			19	0	10	12
			12	0	11	38
			9	0	11	13
			2	0	11	38
		29	22	0	09	61
			21/1	0	01	51
			20/2/1	0	03	28
			20/2/2	0	00	75
			20/1	0	03	03
			19	0	04	04
			12/2	0	00	25
			11	0	09	10
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13
		22	21	0	10	37
			26	0	00	75
			20	0	11	13
			11/2	0	11	13
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13
		11	21	0	10	62
			20	0	11	13
			11	0	11	13
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area			
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre	
3. SITHANA	14	6	21	0	11	13	
			20	0	11	38	
			95	0	02	53	
			101/2	0	01	77	
			121	0	00	50	
			388	0	02	02	
			393	0	01	01	
			417	0	01	01	
			16	0	10	12	
			15	0	11	13	
			6	0	11	13	
			5	0	11	13	
			97	25	0	11	13
			24	0	00	25	
			17	0	02	53	
			16	0	08	60	
			14	0	05	56	
			15	0	05	56	
			6	0	03	03	
			7	0	08	09	
			4	0	10	12	
			5	0	00	75	
			91	24	0	11	13
			17/1	0	11	13	
			14	0	11	13	
			7	0	11	13	
			4	0	11	13	
			75	24	0	11	13
			17	0	11	13	
			14	0	11	13	
			7	0	11	13	
			4	0	11	13	

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		67	24	0	11	13
			17	0	14	16
			16/2	0	00	25
			14	0	01	77
			15/1	0	12	39
		68	2	0	00	25
		49	22	0	12	39
			19/2	0	10	87
			12	0	07	33
			9	0	11	13
			2	0	11	13
		42	22	0	11	13
			19	0	11	13
			12	0	11	13
			9	0	11	13
			2	0	11	13
		26	22	0	11	13
			19/2	0	10	12
			12	0	11	13
			9	0	11	13
			10	0	00	25
			2	0	09	10
			1	0	02	02
		20	22/2	0	01	26
			21	0	04	55
			22/1	0	03	28
			20	0	09	61
			19	0	01	51
			11/2	0	11	13
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	11	13

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustafil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Square Metre
		7	21	0	11	13
			20	0	11	13
			11	0	11	38
			10	0	04	55
			130/2	0	04	04
			131	0	01	77
			134	0	01	51
			159	0	00	50

[F. No. L-14014/34/2006-G.P.]
S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 2006

का. अ. 4419.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 1852 दिनांक 10.05.2006, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, दम्हरी (उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में) से पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य में) तक, प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "आर.-एल.एन.जी. स्पर पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील पानीपत जिला पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य) की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 12.06.2006 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : पानीपत		जिला : पानीपत		राज्य : हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. पहलादपुर खलीला	34		39	0	00	75
			351	0	08	34
			350	0	01	26
			352	0	00	50
			366	0	10	12
			369	0	00	25
			367	0	03	03
			368	0	07	08
			372	0	02	27
			373	0	06	32
			385	0	05	56
			386	0	05	31
			388	0	10	62
			389	0	00	25
			390	0	09	10
			391	0	01	77
			374	0	00	75
			395	0	09	61
			396	0	01	51
			535	0	00	25
			536	0	00	25
			537	0	09	61
			542	0	01	26
			550	0	01	51
			564	0	00	25
			565	0	01	01
			566	0	02	27
			567	0	10	37
			568	0	04	04
			569	0	06	83
			574	0	00	25

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			575	0	02	53
			576	0	06	32
			577	0	08	34
			646	0	07	84
			647	0	00	25
			652	0	01	01
			653	0	09	86
			654	0	01	01
			655	0	09	86
			657	0	03	28
			658	0	06	83
			663	0	05	06
			664	0	06	57
			665	0	03	03
			761	0	09	61
			762	0	01	26
			763	0	09	86
			764	0	01	01
			766	0	07	08
			767	0	00	25
			771	0	04	30
			772	0	06	57
			774	0	10	87
			775	0	03	79
			789	0	00	50
			797	0	02	53
			790	0	10	12
2. डिवाना	33	24	25/2	0	01	26
			16/2/2	0	11	38
			17/1	0	02	27
			15/1	0	00	25
			14	0	13	66
			7	0	04	04

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			8	0	09	61
			3	0	11	38
			2/1	0	00	50
			2/2	0	02	02
		67	22	0	12	90
			23	0	00	25
			19	0	03	79
			20	0	10	12
			11	0	09	86
		66	15/1	0	01	77
			15/2	0	01	01
			6	0	13	40
			7/1	0	00	25
			5	0	02	02
			4/1	0	09	36
			4/2	0	01	77
		63	24	0	06	83
			23	0	05	81
			18	0	12	39
			19	0	01	51
			13	0	00	25
			12	0	13	40
			9	0	05	81
			10	0	06	57
			1	0	11	63
		52	21/1	0	09	61
			21/2	0	00	25
			20	0	00	25
		51	25	0	01	51
			16	0	11	38
			15	0	12	14
			14	0	00	50
			6	0	01	26

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			7	0	08	60
			4/4	0	00	25
			4/5	0	04	04
			4/1	0	02	02
			4/2	0	04	04
		46	24/1	0	03	79
			24/2	0	00	50
			23/2	0	05	81
			18	0	12	39
			13	0	09	86
			12/2	0	01	26
			8	0	00	50
			9	0	11	89
			2/1	0	01	77
			2/2	0	10	62
			1	0	00	25
		31	22/1	0	00	25
			22/2	0	03	03
			21/1	0	06	07
			21/2	0	03	28
			20	0	12	39
			11	0	05	31
		30	15	0	05	81
			6	0	11	13
			5	0	10	62
			4	0	01	51
		26	25	0	00	50
			24	0	11	38
			17	0	11	89
			14/1/2	0	02	27
			14/1/1/1	0	01	01
			14/1/1/2	0	00	50
			26	0	02	27

पौदे का नाम	हृदयस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13	0	06	07
			8	0	10	12
			3	0	01	26
			92/2	0	02	27
			94/2	0	01	26
			95	0	00	25
			118	0	00	75
			125	0	00	75
			126	0	03	28
			129/1	0	03	28
			207/2	0	00	25
			214	0	03	03
			217	0	01	01
			219	0	01	26
			224	0	00	50
2 587	25	44	2/1	0	00	25
			2/2	0	00	50
			9/1	0	01	01
			9/2	0	04	55
		43	7	0	18	46
			4	0	04	04
			27	0	00	25
			3	0	03	03
			2	0	07	33
			26	0	00	75
	25		22	0	03	28
			19	0	03	03
			20	0	00	25
			11	0	06	57
		4	5/1/1	0	00	25
			6/1/2	0	03	54
			6/2	0	01	77

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			5/1	0	00	75
		18	24	0	03	28
			18/1	0	00	25
			12	0	00	25
			19/1	0	08	09
			20	0	01	01
			11/1	0	01	01
			11/2	0	07	59
		19	15/1	0	04	55
			15/2	0	06	83
			14	0	12	39
			13/1	0	02	78
			13/2	0	09	61
			12	0	16	44
			11/1	0	05	81
			10/2	0	00	50
		20	6	0	05	56
			15	0	06	83
			14/1	0	00	50
			14/2	0	00	75
			7	0	11	13
			8/2	0	12	65
			86	0	10	62
			102/1	0	07	84
			103	0	04	04
			112	0	01	77
			119	0	02	53
			128	0	00	75
			132	0	00	50
			139	0	04	04
			158	0	00	25
			159	0	03	54

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			160	0	00	50
			161	0	05	06
			172	0	01	77
			174	0	01	01
			199	0	00	25
			200	0	03	03
			201	0	02	53
			202	0	00	25
			208	0	03	79
			209	0	02	02
			210	0	00	25
			211	0	01	26
			213	0	09	86
			220	0	00	25
			221	0	00	75
			317	0	00	75
4. बिन्दील	28	59	9	0	12	14
			10	0	12	39
			6	0	12	39
		60	7	0	10	12
			4/2	0	01	26
			8	0	01	01
		56	3	0	14	42
			23	0	03	79
			22	0	04	30
			19	0	06	07
			20	0	07	08
		55	11	0	10	62
			6	0	10	62
			15	0	00	25
			5	0	01	51
			7	0	00	25
			4	0	12	90

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किल्ला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	इंकर	वर्गमीटर
		42	24	0	06	07
			23	0	05	56
			19	0	02	27
			12	0	13	91
			9/1	0	00	25
			9/2	0	00	50
			11/2	0	00	75
			10	0	14	16
			1	0	03	54
		43	5	0	11	38
		33	25/1	0	00	25
			25/2	0	07	59
			24	0	07	33
			17	0	09	86
			18	0	02	78
			13	0	14	92
			12	0	00	75
			9/1	0	07	08
			9/2	0	03	03
			2	0	03	54
			1	0	13	91
		32	5	0	00	50
		23	21	0	00	50
		24	25	0	13	66
			24	0	05	31
			17	0	09	86
			18	0	10	37
			13	0	04	80
			12	0	14	42
			9	0	00	50
			11	0	00	50
			10/1	0	07	08
			10/2	0	05	81

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		25	6	0	06	83
			5	0	08	09
			4	0	11	38
			3	0	00	25
		13	24	0	02	53
			23	0	14	67
			22	0	02	53
			18	0	00	25
			19	0	12	14
			20	0	07	84
			11	0	07	08
		12	15	0	10	12
			6	0	08	85
			7	0	02	02
			100	0	15	43
			107	0	04	55
			112	0	01	77
			114	0	04	30
			122	0	01	77
			122/1	0	01	01
			126	0	01	77
			324	0	01	26
			325	0	01	01
			331	0	00	75
			332	0	01	01
			357	0	00	50
			362	0	01	26
			407	0	01	01
5. जाटौल	27	73	4	0	09	86
		57	24	0	11	13
			17	0	05	81
			18	0	06	32
			13/1	0	02	53

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13/2	0	09	61
			8	0	12	14
			3/1	0	03	79
			9/1	0	00	25
			2	0	08	34
	53		22	0	10	87
			19	0	11	63
			20	0	00	25
			12	0	03	03
			11	0	09	10
			10	0	12	14
			1/3	0	01	51
			1/1	0	07	33
	52		5	0	01	01
	36		21/2	0	01	26
	37		25	0	10	12
			16	0	12	14
			15	0	10	87
			14	0	01	26
			7	0	08	60
			6	0	02	53
			4	0	11	38
	31		24	0	10	87
			17/1	0	02	02
			17/2	0	04	04
			14/1	0	11	38
			7	0	07	59
			13	0	00	25
			8	0	03	54
			4	0	01	26
			3	0	10	12
	17		23	0	11	38
			18	0	11	38

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13/1	0	10	62
			13/2	0	01	01
			8	0	11	38
			9	0	00	25
			3	0	09	61
			2	0	01	51
		12	23	0	06	07
			22	0	05	06
			19/1	0	08	60
			18	0	02	53
			13	0	00	25
			12/2	0	10	62
			9	0	11	63
			2	0	10	87
		4	21	0	02	53
			22	0	05	31
			20	0	11	63
			19	0	00	25
			11	0	12	14
			10/1	0	07	33
			10/2	0	00	25
		5	6/1/1	0	00	50
			6/2	0	01	77
			5	0	05	06
			117	0	05	06
			123	0	02	27
			126	0	02	27
			150	0	00	50
			163	0	01	01
			343	0	03	28
			344	0	00	50

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
6. सिकन्दरपुर	19	24	347	0	01	01
			364	0	01	26
			368	0	01	01
			11/1	0	04	04
			11/2	0	07	59
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	07	33
		23	6/1	0	00	25
			5	0	02	27
		14	21/1	0	02	27
		15	25/2	0	09	10
			16/1	0	11	13
		6	15/1	0	10	12
			15/2	0	01	01
			6/1	0	11	13
			5/2	0	11	13
			25	0	12	90
			103	0	01	01
			20	0	00	25
			19	0	11	38
			12	0	08	60
			11	0	04	30
7. रजापुर	13	63	9	0	00	25
			10/1	0	01	26
			10/2	0	11	38
			1	0	07	84
		62	5	0	04	80
			25	0	12	65
		58	16	0	07	84
			17	0	03	79
			14	0	12	65

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			7	0	08	34
			8	0	04	30
			4	0	00	25
			3	0	12	65
		43	23	0	05	81
			22	0	04	55
			19	0	12	65
			12	0	07	84
			11	0	05	06
			10	0	06	57
			89	0	02	27
			117	0	00	25
8. ददलाना	25	122	10	0	06	57
			1	0	06	83
		121	5	0	05	81
		117	25	0	12	65
			16	0	05	31
			17	0	07	33
			14	0	12	65
			7	0	03	03
			13	0	00	25
			8	0	09	61
			3	0	11	89
			2	0	01	01
		114	23	0	00	75
			22	0	11	89
			19	0	02	53
			12	0	00	25
			11	0	02	53
			10	0	01	51
		113	5	0	03	28
		110	25	0	01	51
			13	0	05	81

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खेसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			8	0	12	65
			3	0	05	81
			2	0	06	83
			17	0	00	50
		104	22	0	12	65
			19	0	06	83
			20	0	05	81
			11	0	12	65
			10	0	07	84
		103	6	0	08	60
			5/2	0	05	81

[फा. सं. एल-14014/34/2006-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th November, 2006

S. O. 4419. — Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 1852 dated the 10th May 2006, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Natural Gas from Dadri in the state of Uttar Pradesh to Panipat in the state of Haryana by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the "R-LNG Spur pipeline from Dadri to Panipat" in Tehsil Panipat, District Panipat, in Haryana State;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 12.06.2006.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : PANIPAT		District : PANIPAT		State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatili No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. PAHALADPUR KHALILA	34		39	0	00	75
			351	0	08	34
			350	0	01	26
			352	0	00	50
			366	0	10	12
			369	0	00	25
			367	0	03	03
			368	0	07	08
			372	0	02	27
			373	0	06	32
			385	0	05	56
			386	0	05	31
			388	0	10	62
			389	0	00	25
			390	0	09	10
			391	0	01	77
			374	0	00	75
			395	0	09	61
			396	0	01	51
			535	0	00	25
			536	0	00	25
			537	0	09	61
			542	0	01	26
			550	0	01	51
			564	0	00	25
			565	0	01	01
			566	0	02	27
			567	0	10	37
			568	0	04	04
			569	0	06	83
			574	0	00	25

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustafi No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Square Metre
			575	0	02	53
			576	0	06	32
			577	0	08	34
			646	0	07	84
			647	0	00	25
			652	0	01	01
			653	0	09	86
			654	0	01	01
			655	0	09	86
			657	0	03	28
			658	0	06	83
			663	0	05	06
			664	0	06	57
			665	0	03	03
			761	0	09	61
			762	0	01	26
			763	0	09	86
			764	0	01	01
			766	0	07	08
			767	0	00	25
			771	0	04	30
			772	0	06	57
			774	0	10	87
			775	0	03	79
			789	0	00	50
			797	0	02	53
			790	0	10	12
2. DIWANA	33	74	25/2	0	01	26
			16/2/2	0	11	38
			17/1	0	02	27
			15/1	0	00	25
			14	0	13	66
			7	0	04	04

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			8	0	09	61
			3	0	11	38
			2/1	0	00	50
			2/2	0	02	02
		67	22	0	12	90
			23	0	00	25
			19	0	03	79
			20	0	10	12
			11	0	09	86
		66	15/1	0	01	77
			15/2	0	01	01
			6	0	13	40
			7/1	0	00	25
			5	0	02	02
			4/1	0	09	36
			4/2	0	01	77
		63	24	0	06	83
			23	0	05	81
			18	0	12	39
			19	0	01	51
			13	0	00	25
			12	0	13	40
			9	0	05	81
			10	0	06	57
			1	0	11	63
		52	21/1	0	09	61
			21/2	0	00	25
			20	0	00	25
		51	25	0	01	51
			16	0	11	38
			15	0	12	14
			14	0	00	50
			6	0	01	26

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatill No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			7	0	08	60
			4/4	0	00	25
			4/5	0	04	04
			4/1	0	02	02
			4/2	0	04	04
		46	24/1	0	03	79
			24/2	0	00	50
			23/2	0	05	81
			18	0	12	39
			13	0	09	86
			12/2	0	01	26
			8	0	00	50
			9	0	11	89
			2/1	0	01	77
			2/2	0	10	62
			1	0	00	25
		31	22/1	0	00	25
			22/2	0	03	03
			21/1	0	06	07
			21/2	0	03	28
			20	0	12	39
			11	0	05	31
		30	15	0	05	81
			6	0	11	13
			5	0	10	62
			4	0	01	51
		26	25	0	00	50
			24	0	11	38
			17	0	11	89
			14/1/2	0	02	27
			14/1/1/1	0	01	01
			14/1/1/2	0	00	50
			26	0	02	27

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13	0	06	07
			8	0	10	12
			3	0	01	26
			92/2	0	02	27
			94/2	0	01	26
			95	0	00	25
			118	0	00	75
			125	0	00	75
			126	0	03	28
			129/1	0	03	28
			207/2	0	00	25
			214	0	03	03
			217	0	01	01
			219	0	01	26
			224	0	00	50
3. MAHRANA	29	44	2/1	0	00	25
			2/2	0	00	50
			9/1	0	01	01
			9/2	0	04	55
		43	7	0	18	46
			4	0	04	04
			27	0	00	25
			3	0	03	03
			2	0	07	33
			26	0	00	75
		25	22	0	03	28
			19	0	03	03
			20	0	00	25
		24	11	0	06	57
			6/1/1	0	00	25
			6/1/2	0	03	54
			6/2	0	01	77

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			5/1	0	00	75
		18	24	0	03	28
			18/1	0	00	25
			12	0	00	25
			19/1	0	08	09
			20	0	01	01
			11/1	0	01	01
			11/2	0	07	59
		19	15/1	0	04	55
			15/2	0	06	83
			14	0	12	39
			13/1	0	02	78
			13/2	0	09	61
			12	0	16	44
			11/1	0	05	81
			10/2	0	00	50
		20	6	0	05	56
			15	0	06	83
			14/1	0	00	50
			14/2	0	00	75
			7	0	11	13
			8/2	0	12	65
			86	0	10	62
			102/1	0	07	84
			103	0	04	04
			112	0	01	77
			119	0	02	53
			128	0	00	75
			132	0	00	50
			139	0	04	04
			158	0	00	25
			159	0	03	54

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatli No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			160	0	00	50
			161	0	05	06
			172	0	01	77
			174	0	01	01
			199	0	00	25
			200	0	03	03
			201	0	02	53
			202	0	00	25
			208	0	03	79
			209	0	02	02
			210	0	00	25
			211	0	01	26
			213	0	09	86
			220	0	00	25
			221	0	00	75
			317	0	00	75
4. BINJHAUL	28	59	9	0	12	14
			10	0	12	39
			6	0	12	39
			7	0	10	12
			4/2	0	01	26
			8	0	01	01
			3	0	14	42
		56	23	0	03	79
			22	0	04	30
			19	0	06	07
			20	0	07	08
			11	0	10	62
		55	6	0	10	62
			15	0	00	25
			5	0	01	51
			7	0	00	25
			4	0	12	90

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatl No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		42	24	0	06	07
			23	0	05	56
			19	0	02	27
			12	0	13	91
			9/1	0	00	25
			9/2	0	00	50
			11/2	0	00	75
			10	0	14	16
			1	0	03	54
		43	5	0	11	38
		33	25/1	0	00	25
			25/2	0	07	59
			24	0	07	33
			17	0	09	86
			18	0	02	78
			13	0	14	92
			12	0	00	75
			9/1	0	07	08
			9/2	0	03	03
			2	0	03	54
			1	0	13	91
		32	5	0	00	50
		23	21	0	00	50
		24	25	0	13	66
			24	0	05	31
			17	0	09	86
			18	0	10	37
			13	0	04	80
			12	0	14	42
			9	0	00	50
			11	0	00	50
			10/1	0	07	08
			10/2	0	05	81

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		25	6	0	06	83
			5	0	08	09
			4	0	11	38
			3	0	00	25
		13	24	0	02	53
			23	0	14	67
			22	0	02	53
			18	0	00	25
			19	0	12	14
			20	0	07	84
			11	0	07	08
		12	15	0	10	12
			6	0	08	85
			7	0	02	02
			100	0	15	43
			107	0	04	55
			112	0	01	77
			114	0	04	30
			122	0	01	77
			122/1	0	01	01
			126	0	01	77
			324	0	01	26
			325	0	01	01
			331	0	00	75
			332	0	01	01
			357	0	00	50
			362	0	01	26
			407	0	01	01
5. JATAUL	27	73	4	0	09	86
		57	24	0	11	13
			17	0	05	81
			18	0	06	32
			13/1	0	02	53

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13/2	0	09	61
			8	0	12	14
			3/1	0	03	79
			9/1	0	00	25
			2	0	08	34
		53	22	0	10	87
			19	0	11	63
			20	0	00	25
			12	0	03	03
			11	0	09	10
			10	0	12	14
			1/3	0	01	51
			1/1	0	07	33
		52	5	0	01	01
		36	21/2	0	01	26
		37	25	0	10	12
			16	0	12	14
			15	0	10	87
			14	0	01	26
			7	0	08	60
			6	0	02	53
			4	0	11	38
		31	24	0	10	87
			17/1	0	02	02
			17/2	0	04	04
			14/1	0	11	38
			7	0	07	59
			13	0	00	25
			8	0	03	54
			4	0	01	26
			3	0	10	12
		17	23	0	11	38
			18	0	11	38

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13/1	0	10	62
			13/2	0	01	01
			8	0	11	38
			9	0	00	25
			3	0	09	61
			2	0	01	51
		12	23	0	06	07
			22	0	05	06
			19/1	0	08	60
			18	0	02	53
			13	0	00	25
			12/2	0	10	62
			9	0	11	63
			2	0	10	87
		4	21	0	02	53
			22	0	05	31
			20	0	11	63
			19	0	00	25
			11	0	12	14
			10/1	0	07	33
			10/2	0	00	25
		5	6/1	0	00	50
			6/2	0	01	77
			5	0	05	06
			117	0	05	06
			123	0	02	27
			126	0	02	27
			150	0	00	50
			163	0	01	01
			343	0	03	28
			344	0	00	50

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatli No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
6. SIKANDARPUR	19	24	347	0	01	01
			364	0	01	26
			368	0	01	01
			11/1	0	04	04
			11/2	0	07	59
			10	0	11	13
			1	0	07	33
		23	6/1	0	00	25
			5	0	02	27
			21/1	0	02	27
		15	25/2	0	09	10
			16/1	0	11	13
			15/1	0	10	12
			15/2	0	01	01
			6/1	0	11	13
			8/2	0	11	13
			25	0	12	90
			103	0	01	01
7. RAZAPUR	13	63	20	0	00	25
			19	0	11	38
			12	0	08	60
			11	0	04	30
			9	0	00	25
			10/1	0	01	26
			10/2	0	11	38
			1	0	07	84
		62	5	0	04	80
			25	0	12	65
		58	16	0	07	84
			17	0	03	79
			14	0	12	65

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatli No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			7	0	08	34
			8	0	04	30
			4	0	00	25
			3	0	12	65
		43	23	0	05	81
			22	0	04	55
			19	0	12	65
			12	0	07	84
			11	0	05	06
			10	0	06	57
			89	0	02	27
			117	0	00	25
8. DADLANA	25	122	10	0	06	57
			1	0	06	83
		121	5	0	05	81
		117	25	0	12	65
			16	0	05	31
			17	0	07	33
			14	0	12	65
			7	0	03	03
			13	0	00	25
			8	0	09	61
			3	0	11	89
			2	0	01	01
		114	23	0	00	75
			22	0	11	89
			19	0	02	53
			12	0	00	25
			11	0	02	53
			10	0	01	51
		113	5	0	03	28
		110	25	0	01	51
			13	0	05	81

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			8	0	12	65
			3	0	05	81
			2	0	06	83
			17	0	00	50
		104	22	0	12	65
			19	0	06	83
			20	0	05	81
			11	0	12	65
			10	0	07	84
		103	6	0	08	60
			5/2	0	05	81

[F. No. L-14014/34/2006-G.P.]
S.B MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4420.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 1965 दिनांक 16.05.2006, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, दादरी (उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में) से पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य में) तक, प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "आर.-एल.एन.जी. स्पर पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील समालखा जिला पानीपत (हरियाणा राज्य) की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आषय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 15.06.2006 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : सामलखा		जिला : पानीपत		राज्य : हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. राकसेडा	91	220	16	0	07	08
			15	0	00	75
			14/1	0	05	06
			14/2	0	06	83
			7/2	0	11	89
			4	0	01	26
			8	0	00	75
			3	0	11	38
		210	23	0	12	14
			22	0	00	50
			18	0	01	51
			19	0	11	13
			12	0	11	89
			11	0	00	75
			9	0	01	26
			10	0	11	38
			1	0	11	63
		207	21	0	01	26
		209	5	0	01	01
		208	25	0	11	38
			16	0	12	14
			17	0	00	50
			15	0	01	77
			14	0	10	87
			7	0	12	39
			4	0	02	02
			8	0	00	25
			3	0	10	62
		183	18	0	02	78
			22	0	02	53
			19	0	09	61
			12	0	12	65

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			9	0	03	03
			11	0	00	25
			10	0	09	61
			1	0	12	65
		179	21	0	04	04
		182	5	0	00	25
		180	25	0	08	60
			16	0	12	65
			15	0	04	30
			14	0	08	09
			7/1	0	03	79
			7/2	0	08	60
			4	0	08	60
			3	0	03	79
		145	24	0	00	25
			23	0	12	39
			18	0	09	86
			19/1	0	02	02
			19/2	0	00	25
			13	0	00	50
			12	0	11	89
			9	0	03	79
			253/2	0	01	51
			254	0	00	50
			808	0	01	01
2. बसाडा	90	48	9	0	08	34
			10	0	01	01
			2	0	01	01
			1	0	11	63
		46	21	0	12	39
			20	0	02	02
		45	25	0	00	25
			16/1	0	03	03
			16/2	0	02	27
			14	0	00	25

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			15	0	15	18
			6	0	03	79
			7	0	08	60
			4/1	0	00	25
			4/2	0	12	39
		40	24/1	0	01	51
			24/2	0	04	04
			23	0	07	08
			18	0	12	65
			13	0	07	59
			12	0	05	06
			9/1	0	01	51
			9/2	0	11	89
			2/1	0	02	27
			2/2	0	03	03
			1	0	07	84
		32	21	0	12	90
			20/1	0	00	50
			20/2	0	01	26
		31	25	0	00	25
			16/1	0	04	04
			16/2	0	04	80
			15	0	12	14
			14	0	01	01
			7/1	0	08	09
			7/2	0	02	53
			6/2	0	00	50
			4/1	0	09	36
			3	0	01	77
		30	23	0	12	90
			24	0	00	25
			18	0	06	57
			19	0	06	57
			12	0	04	04
			61	0	02	27

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
3. महावटी	89	39	63	0	00	75
			74	0	01	26
			79	0	00	75
			107	0	01	51
			119	0	02	02
			12/1	0	00	25
			12/2	0	00	50
			12/3	0	03	54
			12/4	0	01	01
			12/5	0	00	50
			12/6	0	03	79
			9	0	04	04
			10/1	0	05	56
			10/4	0	03	28
			1	0	10	37
		40	5	0	03	03
		37	25	0	14	42
			16	0	02	02
			24	0	00	25
			17/1	0	09	36
			17/2	0	03	54
			14	0	06	07
			13/1	0	06	83
			13/2	0	01	51
			8	0	09	61
			9	0	00	50
			2	0	13	91
			1/2	0	00	50
		22	22	0	01	51
			21/1/1	0	08	09
			21/1/2	0	00	50
			21/2	0	04	80
			20	0	05	81
		23	16	0	08	85
			15	0	07	33

गौव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			14/1	0	07	08
			14/2	0	05	81
			7	0	01	26
			8/1	0	08	60
			8/2	0	06	07
			13	0	00	50
			3	0	04	04
			2/1	0	04	04
			2/2	0	03	28
			2/3	0	00	50
			2/4	0	01	01
		18	22/2/1	0	03	28
			22/2/2	0	01	77
			22/1	0	04	55
			19	0	00	50
			21/1	0	00	25
			20	0	11	38
			11/1	0	07	59
			11/2	0	00	25
			10	0	00	25
		17	15/1	0	01	26
			6/1	0	13	15
			6/2	0	00	50
			5	0	02	53
			7/1	0	00	25
			4	0	11	13
		6	24	0	07	84
			23	0	06	83
			18	0	11	63
			19	0	00	50
			104	0	02	27
			110	0	04	55
			162	0	01	26
			165	0	00	25
			166	0	00	25

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
4. देहरा	85	102	178	0	01	01
			352	0	04	30
			408	0	01	51
			13	0	01	01
			12	0	16	69
			11	0	00	25
			9	0	02	27
			10	0	12	14
			1	0	05	81
		103	5	0	07	84
		88	25	0	10	87
			16	0	00	25
			24/2	0	02	78
			17	0	11	63
			14	0	01	26
			18	0	00	50
			13	0	12	65
			8/1	0	02	78
			8/2	0	04	55
			9	0	06	57
			2	0	12	39
			1	0	01	51
		80	22	0	00	50
			21	0	13	66
			20	0	05	31
		81	16	0	08	60
			15/1	0	05	06
			15/2	0	06	07
			14	0	01	51
			6	0	00	25
			7	0	13	91
			4/1	0	00	25
			4/2	0	04	04
			3	0	09	86

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		62	23/1	0	01	77
			23/2	0	06	57
			22/1	0	02	78
			18/2	0	00	25
			19	0	14	42
			12	0	03	54
			20/1	0	00	25
			11	0	10	87
			10	0	09	61
		61	6	0	04	55
			5	0	13	91
			4	0	00	25
		56	25	0	01	51
			24/2	0	11	63
			17/3	0	07	84
			18	0	06	57
			13	0	13	66
			12/1	0	00	75
			8	0	01	26
			9	0	13	15
			2/1	0	06	07
			1	0	08	09
		35	21/1	0	00	75
			21/2	0	01	01
			21/3	0	04	04
			29	0	03	28
			20	0	00	25
		34	25	0	00	50
			16	0	13	15
			15	0	04	30
			14/1	0	07	59
			14/2	0	00	75
			7	0	12	14
			8	0	02	02
			4	0	00	25

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एकर	वर्गमीटर
			3/1	0	02	53
			3/2	0	11	38
		31	22/1	0	06	07
			22/2	0	02	53
			23/1	0	00	25
			23/2	0	05	56
			19/1	0	06	07
			19/2	0	05	81
			12/2	0	00	25
			20/1/1	0	02	27
			11/1	0	06	07
			11/2	0	06	57
			10	0	03	28
		32	6	0	08	85
			5	0	08	60
			4	0	04	04
		8	24/1	0	05	56
			24/2	0	01	77
			121	0	04	55
			122	0	02	27
			123	0	03	03
			193	0	01	26
			229	0	01	01
			637	0	01	26
			638	0	01	01
			653	0	01	26
			661	0	02	53
			667	0	01	51
			726	0	01	01
8. ठिकाणला	81	128	24	0	07	84
			17/2/1/1	0	00	25
			17/2/1/2	0	00	25
			17/2/2/1	0	01	01
			17/2/2/2	0	01	77
			18	0	10	62

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13	0	09	61
			12	0	04	30
			9/1	0	08	09
			9/2	0	05	31
			2/1	0	00	50
			2/2	0	01	01
			10/1	0	00	25
			1	0	11	38
		106	21	0	09	36
		105	25	0	03	28
			16	0	13	66
			26	0	00	25
			17	0	00	25
			15	0	02	53
			14	0	11	38
			7	0	06	07
			4	0	01	77
			8	0	04	30
			3	0	13	91
			2	0	00	25
		103	23	0	02	53
			22/1	0	09	10
			22/2	0	02	27
			19	0	04	55
			140	0	01	77
			162	0	01	26
			546/1	0	01	51
6. जौरासी सर्फ खास	72	124	19	0	04	55
			20	0	04	55
			11	0	13	66
			10	0	02	78
		125	15/2	0	00	25
			6/1/1	0	04	04
			6/1/2	0	01	51
			3/2/1	0	04	04
			6/2/2	0	00	50

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			5/1	0	10	87
			4	0	02	78
		121	24	0	13	40
			17	0	03	79
			18	0	09	86
			25/1	0	00	25
			13/1	0	05	81
			13/2	0	04	30
			12/1	0	02	78
			8	0	00	25
			9/1	0	12	65
			9/2	0	00	75
			2	0	03	54
			1	0	08	34
		114	21	0	12	14
			20	0	04	04
			1/2	0	00	25
			10	0	01	51
			11/1	0	02	53
			11/2	0	00	25
		115	25	0	01	51
			16	0	07	08
			15/2	0	08	60
			6/1	0	09	61
			5/1	0	01	01
			5/2/2	0	04	30
		108	25	0	11	13
			16	0	13	91
			15/1	0	01	51
			17/1	0	00	25
			14/1	0	09	10
			14/2	0	03	54
			7/1	0	01	26
			7/2	0	05	56
			8	0	07	59
			3	0	11	63

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			2/1	0	00	25
			2/2	0	02	27
		100	23	0	00	25
			22	0	14	16
			19	0	03	54
			20	0	09	36
			21	0	00	25
			11/1	0	06	32
			27	0	03	54
		101	15	0	06	07
			6/1	0	10	62
			6/2	0	02	53
			5/1	0	01	01
			7	0	00	75
			4/1	0	02	27
			4/2	0	08	85
		88	24/1	0	05	06
			23	0	09	36
			18/1	0	01	77
			18/2	0	09	10
			19/1/1	0	03	54
			19/1/2	0	00	25
			12	0	13	15
			9	0	01	77
			10/1	0	12	39
			10/2	0	00	25
			11	0	00	25
			1/1	0	06	57
			1/2	0	00	50
		87	5	0	07	33
		81	25	0	12	65
			24	0	01	77
			16	0	00	25
			17	0	14	16
			14	0	03	54

गौव का नाम			खेदबस्त संख्या	मुक्तमाला संख्या	खसरा/किले संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
						हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
10	10	0	8		13	0	10	87
11	00	0	102		8/1	0	00	25
12	40	0	020		8/2	0	06	07
13	40	0	1020	57	9	0	06	32
14	30	0	05		2	0	10	87
15	00	0	1020		1	0	04	55
16	00	0	001	63	21	0	11	89
17	40	0	001	62	25/1	0	02	02
18	10	0	001		25/2	0	02	78
19	20	0	001		16/1	0	01	77
20	00	0	001		16/2	0	10	62
21	00	0	001		17/1	0	02	02
22	00	0	001		17/2	0	01	77
23	00	0	1000		17/3	0	00	25
24	00	0	0000		14/1	0	00	25
25	0	0	0000	58	14/2	0	12	39
26	00	0	1001		13	0	03	54
27	00	0	001		8	0	11	63
28	00	0	001		9	0	03	54
29	00	0	001		3/2	0	00	25
30	10	0	001		2/1	0	08	60
31	00	0	0		2/2	0	04	30
32	00	0	100		1	0	03	54
33	00	0	0	57	21	0	12	65
34	00	0	001	58	25/1/1	0	02	27
35	00	0	001		25/1/2	0	00	75
36	00	0	001		25/2/1	0	00	25
37	00	0	001		25/2/2	0	00	50
38	00	0	001		16/1	0	04	80
39	00	0	001	58	16/2/1	0	05	81
40	00	0	001		16/2/2	0	00	25
41	00	00	01		17/1	0	02	53
42	00	00	01		17/2	0	00	25
43	00	00	001		14	0	11	63
44	00	00	001		7	0	11	63

गौव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			4	0	07	59
			3/1	0	00	25
			3/2	0	04	04
		32	24/1	0	00	25
			23	0	08	34
			144/1	0	05	56
			152	0	03	54
			198	0	01	01
			199	0	01	01
			727	0	03	28
			758	0	01	26
			760	0	01	51
			762	0	00	50
			798/1	0	00	75
			798/3	0	01	51
7. जौरासी खालसा	74	93	22/2/2	0	00	50
			18/1	0	08	34
			18/2	0	03	54
			13/1	0	07	33
			13/2	0	04	04
			8/2	0	07	33
			9	0	04	04
			3/1	0	00	25
			2	0	11	13
		84	22/1	0	04	80
			22/2	0	07	59
			19/2	0	04	04
			20/1	0	05	31
			20/2	0	01	77
		83	16/1	0	09	36
			16/2	0	3	79
			15	00	2	02
			17	00	2	78
			124	00	01	01
			126	00	03	28

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
8. गढ़ी छाजू	73	85	14/1	00	10	12
			14/2	00	01	01
			17	00	00	25
			13	0	03	28
			7	0	00	25
			8	0	13	15
			3	0	00	25
			9/2	0	00	75
			2	0	14	42
			1/1	0	00	75
		80	22	0	00	75
			21/1	0	04	04
			21/2	0	08	09
		81	20	0	02	53
			25/1	0	00	25
			16/1	0	07	84
			16/2	0	05	31
			15	0	03	28
			14/1	0	00	25
			14/2	0	10	62
			7	0	06	57
			8/1	0	05	81
			8/2/1	0	02	78
			8/2/2	0	00	25
			3	0	09	10
		71	2	0	06	32
			22	0	10	12
			21	0	03	03
			20	0	12	90
			11/1	0	00	25
		70	16	0	01	01
			15	0	00	25
			115	0	02	27
			148	0	01	01
			381	0	03	79
			383	0	01	77

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एकर	वर्गफीट
9. करहंस	69	110	15	0	10	62
			14	0	00	25
			6	0	02	27
			7	0	11	89
			4/1	0	00	25
			4/2	0	03	09
			3	0	04	55
		106	23	0	13	68
			18	0	02	27
			22	0	00	25
			19	0	12	14
			12/2	0	08	85
			11/1	0	01	01
			11/2	0	04	30
			10/1	0	02	78
			10/2	0	10	87
			1	0	01	51
		107	6	0	00	25
			5/1	0	04	55
			5/2	0	05	06
		99	25	0	07	08
			24	0	09	86
			17	0	06	07
			18/1	0	07	33
			18/2	0	02	27
			13/1	0	04	55
			12/1	0	03	09
			12/2	0	04	30
			9/2	0	03	03
			10	0	13	91
		98	1	0	02	53
			6	0	09	25
			5	0	13	91
			4	0	00	50

सैनिक का नाम	हस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
		90	25	0	01	01
			24	0	14	16
			17	0	00	25
			23/1	0	01	01
			18	0	14	42
			19	0	02	27
			13/1	0	00	25
			12	0	13	91
			11	0	03	03
			9	0	00	25
			10/1	0	05	56
			10/2	0	06	83
		91	6/1	0	01	26
			6/2	0	02	27
			5/1	0	02	53
			5/2	0	08	60
			4/1	0	04	80
		77	24/2	0	09	86
			23	0	07	08
			18/2	0	08	34
			19	0	08	60
			12	0	05	81
			11	0	09	86
			10	0	06	32
		76	6/1	0	08	09
			6/2	0	02	53
			5	0	05	31
			4	0	10	62
		70	24	0	03	79
			23	0	13	15
			18/1	0	00	25
			18/2	0	02	02
			22	0	00	25
			19	0	14	42
			12	0	02	27

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			11/1	0	03	79
			11/2	0	09	36
			10	0	01	77
		54	24/2	0	00	75
			23	0	01	01
		71	3	0	10	87
			2	0	02	27
			1	0	09	10
			15	0	00	25
			6	0	09	36
			5	0	00	50
			7/2	0	00	25
			4	0	14	92
		72	5	0	03	79
			6/1	0	05	81
			7/1	0	10	62
			7/2	0	00	50
			8	0	12	65
			9	0	09	10
			12	0	04	55
			10	0	00	25
			11	0	13	15
		73	15/1	0	05	31
			15/2	0	00	25
			16	0	00	75
			14	0	01	77
		30	4	0	04	80
		13	24/1	0	02	02
			24/2	0	06	57
			23/2	0	04	55
			18	0	13	91
			13	0	02	78
			19	0	00	25
			12/2	0	10	87
			9	0	11	38

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			2	0	08	85
			1/1	0	00	25
		11	21	0	06	07
			22/1	0	04	04
			119	0	04	55
			125	0	11	13
			129	0	03	03
			131	0	02	27
			136	0	01	01
			172	0	02	53
			174	0	01	01
			176	0	01	01
			183	0	01	01
			351	0	06	32
			363	0	01	26
			393	0	01	26
			398	0	01	26
			399	0	01	26
			402	0	01	26
			403	0	01	26
			404	0	05	06
10. मनाना		33	17	0	09	86
			13	0	02	27
			18	0	11	63
			19	0	01	77
			12	0	11	13
			11	0	10	62
			10	0	06	57
		34	6	0	08	85
			5	0	08	85
			4	0	05	81
		31	24	0	10	62
			23	0	05	06
			18	0	12	14
			19	0	03	28

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	भुक्तितल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
			13	0	00	25
			12	0	14	42
			9	0	00	50
			11	0	01	01
			10	0	14	42
			1	0	03	03
		30	5	0	11	89
			6	0	00	25
		17	25/1	0	05	81
			25/2	0	00	50
			24/1	0	08	85
			17	0	09	86
			18	0	05	06
			13	0	13	40
			12	0	01	77
			8	0	00	25
			9	0	14	67
			2	0	01	51
			10	0	00	25
			1	0	13	66
		14	21	0	05	31
		13	25	0	08	85
			16	0	10	87
			17	0	03	28
			15	0	00	25
			14	0	14	16
			13	0	00	25
			7	0	02	53
			8	0	11	89
			3	0	07	84
			2	0	06	83

गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्तसिल संख्या	खसरा/ बिल्ला संख्या	केमान्त		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	कमीटर
		4	22	0	12	98
			21	0	01	77
			19	0	00	50
			20	0	13	66
			11	0	08	57
		5	15/2	0	07	59
			6	0	13	15
			7	0	01	01
			5	0	00	75
			4	0	09	36
			248	0	01	26
			250	0	00	50

[फा. सं. एल-14014/34/2006-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th November, 2006

S. O. 4420.— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 1965 dated the 16th May 2006, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1982 (50 of 1982), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Natural Gas from Dadri in the state of Uttar Pradesh to Panipat in the state of Haryana by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the "R-LNG Spur pipeline from Dadri to Panipat" in Tehsil Samalkha, District Panipat, in Haryana State;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 15.06.2006.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : SAMALKHA		District : PANIPAT		State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. RAKHSEDA	91	220	16	0	07	08
			15	0	00	75
			14/1	0	05	06
			14/2	0	06	83
			7/2	0	11	89
			4	0	01	26
			8	0	00	75
			3	0	11	38
		210	23	0	12	14
			22	0	00	50
			18	0	01	51
			19	0	11	13
			12	0	11	89
			11	0	00	75
			9	0	01	26
			10	0	11	38
			1	0	11	63
		207	21	0	01	26
		209	5	0	01	01
		208	25	0	11	38
			16	0	12	14
			17	0	00	50
			15	0	01	77
			14	0	10	87
			7	0	12	39
			4	0	02	02
			8	0	00	25
			3	0	10	62
		183	18	0	02	78
			22	0	02	53
			19	0	09	61
			12	0	12	65

Name of Village	Hectare No.	Acre No.	Kata / Kata No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Square Metre
			9	0	03	03
			11	0	00	25
			10	0	09	61
			1	0	12	65
		179	21	0	04	04
		182	5	0	00	25
		180	25	0	08	60
			16	0	12	65
			15	0	04	30
			14	0	08	09
			7/1	0	03	79
			7/2	0	08	60
			4	0	08	60
			3	0	03	79
		145	24	0	00	25
			23	0	12	39
			18	0	09	86
			19/1	0	02	02
			19/2	0	00	25
			13	0	00	50
			12	0	11	89
			9	0	03	79
			253/2	0	01	51
			254	0	00	50
			808	0	01	01
2. BASEDA	90	48	9	0	08	34
			10	0	01	01
			2	0	01	01
			1	0	11	63
		48	21	0	12	39
			20	0	02	02
		45	25	0	00	25
			16/1	0	03	03
			16/2	0	02	27
			14	0	00	25

Name of Village	Hachest No.	Mushatth No.	Khara / Kila No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			15	0	15	18
			6	0	03	79
			7	0	08	60
			4/1	0	00	25
			4/2	0	12	39
		40	24/1	0	01	51
			24/2	0	04	04
			23	0	07	08
			18	0	12	65
			13	0	07	58
			12	0	05	08
			9/1	0	01	51
			9/2	0	11	89
			2/1	0	02	27
			2/2	0	03	03
			1	0	07	84
		32	21	0	12	90
			20/1	0	00	50
			20/2	0	01	26
		31	25	0	00	25
			16/1	0	04	04
			16/2	0	04	80
			15	0	12	14
			14	0	01	01
			7/1	0	08	09
			7/2	0	02	53
			6/2	0	00	50
			4/1	0	09	36
			3	0	01	77
		30	23	0	12	90
			24	0	00	25
			18	0	06	57
			19	0	06	57
			12	0	04	04
			61	0	02	27

Name of Village	Masthead No.	Plot No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Square Metre
3. BHANAVATI	89	39	63	0	00	75
			74	0	01	26
			79	0	00	75
			107	0	01	51
			119	0	02	02
			12/1	0	00	25
			12/2	0	00	50
			12/3	0	03	54
			12/4	0	01	01
			12/5	0	00	50
			12/6	0	03	79
			9	0	04	04
			10/1	0	05	56
			10/4	0	03	28
			1	0	10	37
		40	5	0	03	03
			25	0	14	42
			16	0	02	02
		37	24	0	00	25
			17/1	0	09	36
			17/2	0	03	54
			14	0	06	07
			13/1	0	06	83
			13/2	0	01	51
			8	0	09	61
			9	0	00	50
			2	0	13	91
		22	1/2	0	00	50
			22	0	01	51
			21/1/1	0	08	09
			21/1/2	0	00	50
			21/2	0	04	80
		23	20	0	05	81
			16	0	08	85
			15	0	07	33

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatl No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			14/1	0	07	08
			14/2	0	05	81
			7	0	01	26
			8/1	0	08	60
			8/2	0	06	07
			13	0	00	50
			3	0	04	04
			2/1	0	04	04
			2/2	0	03	28
			2/3	0	00	50
			2/4	0	01	01
		18	22/2/1	0	03	28
			22/2/2	0	01	77
			22/1	0	04	55
			19	0	00	50
			21/1	0	00	25
			20	0	11	38
			11/1	0	07	59
			11/2	0	00	25
			10	0	00	25
		17	15/1	0	01	26
			6/1	0	13	15
			6/2	0	00	50
			5	0	02	53
			7/1	0	00	25
			4	0	11	13
		6	24	0	07	84
			23	0	06	83
			18	0	11	63
			19	0	00	50
			104	0	02	27
			110	0	04	55
			162	0	01	26
			165	0	00	25
			166	0	00	25

Name of Village	Hachest No.	Mustali No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
4. DEHRA	85	102	178	0	01	01
			352	0	04	30
			408	0	01	51
			13	0	01	01
			12	0	16	69
			11	0	00	25
			9	0	02	27
			10	0	12	14
			1	0	05	81
			5	0	07	84
		103	25	0	10	87
			16	0	00	25
			24/2	0	02	78
			17	0	11	63
			14	0	01	26
			18	0	00	50
			13	0	12	65
			8/1	0	02	78
			8/2	0	04	55
			8	0	06	57
		80	2	0	12	39
			1	0	01	51
			22	0	00	50
			21	0	13	66
			20	0	05	31
		81	16	0	08	60
			15/1	0	05	06
			15/2	0	06	07
			14	0	01	51
			6	0	00	25
			7	0	13	91
			4/1	0	00	25
			4/2	0	04	04
			3	0	09	86

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustati No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		62	23/1	0	01	77
			23/2	0	06	57
			22/1	0	02	78
			18/2	0	00	25
			19	0	14	42
			12	0	03	54
			20/1	0	00	25
			11	0	10	87
			10	0	09	61
		61	6	0	04	55
			5	0	13	91
			4	0	00	25
		56	25	0	01	51
			24/2	0	11	63
			17/3	0	07	84
			18	0	06	57
			13	0	13	66
			12/1	0	00	75
			8	0	01	26
			9	0	13	15
			2/1	0	06	07
			1	0	08	09
		35	21/1	0	00	75
			21/2	0	01	01
			21/3	0	04	04
			29	0	03	28
			20	0	00	25
		34	25	0	00	50
			18	0	13	15
			15	0	04	30
			14/1	0	07	59
			14/2	0	00	75
			7	0	12	14
			8	0	02	02
			4	0	00	25

Name of Village	Headbeat No.	Mushatti No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Square Metre
			3/1	0	02	53
			3/2	0	11	38
		31	22/1	0	08	07
			22/2	0	02	53
			23/1	0	00	25
			23/2	0	05	56
			19/1	0	06	07
			19/2	0	05	81
			12/2	0	00	25
			20/1/1	0	02	27
			11/1	0	06	07
			11/2	0	06	57
			10	0	03	28
		32	6	0	08	85
			5	0	08	60
			4	0	04	04
		8	24/1	0	35	56
			24/2	0	01	77
			121	0	04	55
			122	0	02	27
			123	0	03	03
			193	0	01	26
			229	0	01	01
			637	0	01	26
			638	0	01	01
			653	0	01	26
			661	0	02	53
			667	0	01	51
			726	0	01	01
5. DIKADLA	81	128	24	0	07	84
			17/2/1/1	0	00	25
			17/2/1/2	0	00	25
			17/2/2/1	0	01	01
			17/2/2/2	0	01	77
			18	0	10	62

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Kitta No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Square Metre
			13	0	09	81
			12	0	04	30
			9/1	0	08	09
			9/2	0	05	31
			2/1	0	00	50
			2/2	0	01	01
			10/1	0	00	25
			1	0	11	38
		106	21	0	09	36
		105	25	0	03	28
			16	0	13	66
			26	0	00	25
			17	0	00	25
			15	0	02	53
			14	0	11	38
			7	0	06	07
			4	0	01	77
			8	0	04	30
			3	0	13	91
			2	0	00	25
		103	23	0	02	53
			22/1	0	09	10
			22/2	0	02	27
			19	0	04	55
			140	0	01	77
			162	0	01	26
			546/1	0	01	51
6. JAURASI SURF KHAS	72	124	19	0	04	55
			20	0	04	55
			11	0	13	66
			10	0	02	78
		125	15/2	0	00	25
			6/1/1	0	04	04
			6/1/2	0	01	51
			6/2/1	0	04	04
			6/2/2	0	00	50

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			5/1	0	10	87
			4	0	02	78
		121	24	0	13	40
			17	0	03	78
			18	0	09	86
			25/1	0	00	25
			13/1	0	05	81
			13/2	0	04	30
			12/1	0	02	78
			8	0	00	25
			9/1	0	12	65
			9/2	0	00	75
			2	0	03	54
			1	0	08	34
		114	21	0	12	14
			20	0	04	04
			1/2	0	00	25
			10	0	01	51
			11/1	0	02	53
			11/2	0	00	25
		115	25	0	01	51
			16	0	07	08
			15/2	0	08	60
			6/1	0	09	61
			5/1	0	01	01
			5/2/2	0	04	30
		108	25	0	11	13
			16	0	13	91
			15/1	0	01	51
			17/1	0	00	25
			14/1	0	09	10
			14/2	0	03	54
			7/1	0	01	26
			7/2	0	05	56
			8	0	07	59
			3	0	11	63

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			2/1	0	00	25
			2/2	0	02	27
		100	23	0	00	25
			22	0	14	16
			19	0	03	54
			20	0	09	36
			21	0	00	25
			11/1	0	06	32
			27	0	03	54
		101	15	0	06	07
			6/1	0	10	62
			6/2	0	02	53
			5/1	0	01	01
			7	0	00	75
			4/1	0	02	27
			4/2	0	08	85
		88	24/1	0	05	06
			23	0	09	36
			18/1	0	01	77
			18/2	0	09	10
			19/1/1	0	03	54
			19/1/2	0	00	25
			12	0	13	15
			9	0	01	77
			10/1	0	12	39
			10/2	0	00	25
			11	0	00	25
			1/1	0	06	57
			1/2	0	00	50
		87	5	0	07	33
		81	25	0	12	65
			24	0	01	77
			16	0	00	25
			17	0	14	16
			14	0	03	54

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatli No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13	0	10	87
			8/1	0	00	25
			8/2	0	06	07
			9	0	06	32
			2	0	10	87
			1	0	04	55
		63	21	0	11	89
		62	25/1	0	02	02
			25/2	0	02	78
			16/1	0	01	77
			16/2	0	10	62
			17/1	0	02	02
			17/2	0	01	77
			17/3	0	00	25
			14/1	0	00	25
			14/2	0	12	39
			13	0	03	54
			8	0	11	63
			9	0	03	54
			3/2	0	00	25
			2/1	0	08	60
			2/2	0	04	30
			1	0	03	54
		57	21	0	12	65
		58	25/1/1	0	02	27
			25/1/2	0	00	75
			25/2/1	0	00	25
			25/2/2	0	00	50
			16/1	0	04	80
			16/2/1	0	05	81
			16/2/2	0	00	25
			17/1	0	02	53
			17/2	0	00	25
			14	0	11	63
			7	0	11	63

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			4	0	07	59
			3/1	0	00	25
			3/2	0	04	04
		32	24/1	0	00	25
			23	0	08	34
			144/1	0	05	56
			152	0	03	54
			198	0	01	01
			199	0	01	01
			727	0	03	28
			758	0	01	26
			760	0	01	51
			762	0	00	50
			798/1	0	00	75
			798/3	0	01	51
7. JAURASI KHALSA	74	93	22/2/2	0	00	50
			18/1	0	08	34
			18/2	0	03	54
			13/1	0	07	33
			13/2	0	04	04
			8/2	0	07	33
			9	0	04	04
			3/1	0	00	25
			2	0	11	13
		84	22/1	0	04	80
			22/2	0	07	59
			19/2	0	04	04
			20/1	0	05	31
			20/2	0	01	77
		83	16/1	0	09	36
			16/2	0	3	79
			15	00	2	02
			17	00	2	78
			124	00	01	01
			126	00	03	28

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
8.GARHI CHHAJU	73	85	14/1	00	10	12
			14/2	00	01	01
			17	00	00	25
			13	0	03	28
			7	0	00	25
			8	0	13	15
			3	0	00	25
			9/2	0	00	75
			2	0	14	42
			1/1	0	00	75
		80	22	0	00	75
			21/1	0	04	04
			21/2	0	08	09
			20	0	02	53
		81	25/1	0	00	25
			16/1	0	07	84
			16/2	0	05	31
			15	0	03	28
			14/1	0	00	25
			14/2	0	10	62
			7	0	06	57
			8/1	0	05	81
			8/2/1	0	02	78
			8/2/2	0	00	25
			3	0	09	10
			2	0	06	32
		71	22	0	10	12
			21	0	03	03
			20	0	12	90
			11/1	0	00	25
		70	16	0	01	01
			15	0	00	25
			115	0	02	27
			148	0	01	01
			381	0	03	79
			383	0	01	77

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
9. KARHANS	69	110	15	0	10	62
			14	0	00	25
			6	0	02	27
			7	0	11	89
			4/1	0	00	25
			4/2	0	08	09
			3	0	04	55
		106	23	0	13	66
			18	0	02	27
			22	0	00	25
			19	0	12	14
			12/2	0	08	85
			11/1	0	01	01
			11/2	0	04	30
			10/1	0	02	78
			10/2	0	10	87
			1	0	01	51
		107	6	0	00	25
			5/1	0	04	55
			5/2	0	05	06
			25	0	07	08
		99	24	0	09	86
			17	0	06	07
			18/1	0	07	33
			18/2	0	02	27
			13/1	0	04	55
			12/1	0	08	09
			12/2	0	04	30
			9/2	0	03	03
			10	0	13	91
			1	0	02	53
		98	6	0	00	25
			5	0	13	91
			4	0	00	50

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		90	25	0	01	01
			24	0	14	16
			17	0	00	25
			23/1	0	01	01
			18	0	14	42
			19	0	02	27
			13/1	0	00	25
			12	0	13	91
			11	0	03	03
			9	0	00	25
			10/1	0	05	56
			10/2	0	06	83
		91	6/1	0	01	26
			6/2	0	02	27
			5/1	0	02	53
			5/2	0	08	60
			4/1	0	04	80
		77	24/2	0	09	86
			23	0	07	08
			18/2	0	08	34
			19	0	08	60
			12	0	05	81
			11	0	09	86
			10	0	06	32
		76	6/1	0	08	09
			6/2	0	02	53
			5	0	05	31
			4	0	10	62
		70	24	0	03	79
			23	0	13	15
			18/1	0	00	25
			18/2	0	02	02
			22	0	00	25
			19	0	14	42
			12	0	02	27

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			11/1	0	03	79
			11/2	0	09	36
			10	0	01	77
		54	24/2	0	00	75
			23	0	01	01
		71	3	0	10	87
			2	0	02	27
			1	0	09	10
			15	0	00	25
			6	0	09	36
			5	0	00	50
			7/2	0	00	25
			4	0	14	92
		72	5	0	03	79
			6/1	0	05	81
			7/1	0	10	62
			7/2	0	00	50
			8	0	12	65
			9	0	09	10
			12	0	04	55
			10	0	00	25
			11	0	13	15
		73	15/1	0	05	31
			15/2	0	00	25
			16	0	00	75
			14	0	01	77
		30	4	0	04	80
		13	24/1	0	02	02
			24/2	0	06	57
			23/2	0	04	55
			18	0	13	91
			13	0	02	78
			19	0	00	25
			12/2	0	10	87
			9	0	11	38

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustati No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
10. MANANA		11	2	0	08	85
			1/1	0	00	25
			21	0	06	07
			22/1	0	04	04
			119	0	04	55
			125	0	11	13
			129	0	03	03
			131	0	02	27
			136	0	01	01
			172	0	02	53
			174	0	01	01
		33	176	0	01	01
			183	0	01	01
			351	0	06	32
			363	0	01	26
			393	0	01	26
			398	0	01	26
			399	0	01	26
			402	0	01	26
			403	0	01	26
			404	0	05	06
		34	17	0	09	86
			13	0	02	27
			18	0	11	63
			19	0	01	77
			12	0	11	13
		31	11	0	10	62
			10	0	06	57
			6	0	08	85
			5	0	08	85
			4	0	05	81
			24	0	10	62
			23	0	05	06
			18	0	12	14
			19	0	03	28

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
			13	0	00	25
			12	0	14	42
			9	0	00	50
			11	0	01	01
			10	0	14	42
			1	0	03	03
		30	5	0	11	89
			6	0	00	25
		17	25/1	0	05	81
			25/2	0	00	50
			24/1	0	08	85
			17	0	09	86
			18	0	05	06
			13	0	13	40
			12	0	01	77
			8	0	00	25
			9	0	14	67
			2	0	01	51
			10	0	00	25
			1	0	13	66
		14	21	0	05	31
		13	25	0	08	85
			16	0	10	87
			17	0	03	28
			15	0	00	25
			14	0	14	16
			13	0	00	25
			7	0	02	53
			8	0	11	89
			3	0	07	84
			2	0	06	83

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatli No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
		4	22	0	12	90
			21	0	01	77
			19	0	00	50
			20	0	13	66
			11	0	06	57
		5	15/2	0	07	59
			6	0	13	15
			7	0	01	01
			5	0	00	75
			4	0	09	36
			248	0	01	26
			250	0	00	50

[F. No. L-14014/34/2006-G.P.]
S.B MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 16 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4421.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन), अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 2797, तारीख 20 जुलाई, 2006 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में, मैसर्स रिलाएंस इंडस्ट्रीस लिमिटेड, के गोवा में उत्तरी/दक्षिणी अपतट में खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्रप्रदेश में संरचनाओं से आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य में पूर्वी गोदावरी जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, एक रिलाएंस समूह कम्पनी, मैसर्स रिलाएंस गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, पूर्ववत् मैसर्स रिलाएंस गैस पाइपलाइन्स लिमिटेड, द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 17 अगस्त, 2006 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में, जनता की ओर से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है ; अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है ;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, मैसर्स रिलाएंस गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, में निहित होगा ।

अनुसूची				
मंडल: ताल्लारेवु		जिला: ईस्ट गोदावरी		राज्य: आन्ध्र प्रदेश
गांव का नाम	सर्वे सं/ सब डिविजन सं	आर ओ यू अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टर	एर	सि एर
1	2	3	4	5
1) मल्लवरम	114	0	10	70
	118/ 1	2	42	70
	118/2	0	28	40
	600/6ए	0	35	75
	600/6सि	0	16	15
	601/1	0	94	95
	603	0	21	55
	604	0	75	25
	605	0	36	70
	617/1	0	39	40
	618/1	0	45	30
	618/2	0	06	85
	618/3	0	45	30
	620	1	46	70
	627/4	0	00	30
	628	0	25	65
	629	0	47	55
	630	0	40	15
	631/10	0	01	60
	631/11/ए	0	00	45
	631/11/बी	0	00	10
	631/2	0	42	70
	631/3	0	35	10
	631/4	0	14	15
	631/5	0	65	05
	631/6ए	0	21	00
	631/6बी	0	02	80
	631/7	0	07	00
	631/8	0	07	45
	631/9ए	0	02	50

1	2	3	4	5
1) मल्लवरम (निरंतर)	631/9वी	0	03	10
	655	0	13	95
	656	0	35	45
	657	0	34	80
	658/1	0	08	40
	658/2	0	31	20
	658/3	0	00	85
	658/4	0	05	70
	659/2	0	21	75
	659/3	0	10	30
	660/2	0	03	60
	660/3	0	08	95
	661	0	22	75
	662/3	0	21	50
	663	0	21	50
	664/1	0	12	75
	664/2	0	07	70
2) पोलेकुरुरु	214/2	0	23	05
	659	0	26	95
	660	0	87	70
	664	0	02	40
	665	0	51	10
	684	0	01	40
	685	0	48	05
	688	0	03	75
मंडल: काजुलुरु	जिला : ईस्ट गोदावरी		राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश	
1) काजुलुरु	557/1	0	01	90
	32/3	0	05	80
	453	0	00	10
2) तग्लमपूडि	113	0	00	10
3) जगन्नादगिरि	242/1	0	21	40

1	2	3	4	5
मंडल: करपा	जिला : ईस्ट गोदावरी			राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश
1) वेमूलवाडा	59/3	0	00	10
	435	0	07	50
	436/1	0	03	40
	436/2	0	03	25
	439/3	0	00	95
	439/4	0	01	95
	439/35	0	01	95
	439/36	0	00	95
	439/37	0	04	30
	439/38	0	05	20
	439/39	0	03	80
	439/44	0	09	80
	444/2वी	0	23	45
	444/3	0	09	85
	444/5	0	11	75
	444/7	0	13	35
	445/1	0	03	10
	445/2	0	01	80
	445/3	0	02	00
	445/5	0	02	35
	465/1	0	09	25
	465/18	0	01	25
	465/19	0	02	55
	465/21	0	00	75
	465/22	0	03	60
	465/23	0	02	35
	465/25	0	08	80
	465/26	0	02	25
	465/27	0	11	55

1	2	3	4	5
2) वेमूलवाडा (निरंतर)	465/28	0	09	40
	468	0	04	55

[फा. सं. एल-14014/45/2002-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 16th November, 2006

S.O. 4421.— Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 2797 dated the 20th July 2006, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of natural gas from the exploration blocks in the Northern/Southern Offshore of Goa and Structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, by a Reliance Group company, M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited, formerly known as M/S Reliance Gas Pipelines Limited, to various consumers of District East Godavari in the State of Andhra Pradesh;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 17th August 2006;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land, specified in the Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of publication of the declaration, in M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited, free from all encumbrances.

Schedule				
Mandal : Tallarevu		District : East Godavari		State : Andhra Pradesh
Village	Survey No./Sub-Division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU		
		Hectare	Are	C-Are
1	2	3	4	5
1) Mallavaram	114	0	10	70
	118/1	2	42	70
	118/2	0	28	40
	600/6A	0	35	75
	600/6C	0	16	15
	601/1	0	94	95
	603	0	21	55
	604	0	75	25
	605	0	36	70
	617/1	0	09	40
	618/1	0	45	30
	618/2	0	06	85
	618/3	0	45	30
	620	1	46	70
	627/4	0	00	30
	628	0	25	65
	629	0	47	55
	630	0	40	15
	631/10	0	01	60
	631/11/A	0	00	45
	631/11/B	0	00	10
	631/2	0	42	70
	631/3	0	35	10
	631/4	0	14	15
	631/5	0	65	05
	631/6A	0	21	00
	631/6B	0	02	80
	631/7	0	07	00
	631/8	0	07	45
	631/9A	0	02	50

1	2	3	4	5
1) Mallavaram (Contd....)	631/9B	0	03	10
	655	0	13	95
	656	0	35	45
	657	0	34	80
	658/1	0	08	40
	658/2	0	31	20
	658/3	0	00	85
	658/4	0	05	70
	659/2	0	21	75
	659/3	0	10	30
	660/2	0	03	60
	660/3	0	08	95
	661	0	22	75
	662/3	0	21	50
	663	0	21	50
	664/1	0	12	75
	664/2	0	07	70
2) Polekurru	214/2	0	23	05
	659	0	26	95
	660	0	87	70
	664	0	02	40
	665	0	51	10
	684	0	01	40
	685	0	48	05
	688	0	03	75
Mandal : Kajuluru	District : East Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) Kajuluru	557/1	0	01	90
	32/3	0	05	80
	453	0	00	10
2) Tarlamapudi	113	0	00	10
3) Jagannadhagiri	242/1	0	21	40

1	2	3	4	5
Mandal : Karapa	District : East Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) Vemulavada	59/3	0	00	10
	435	0	07	50
	436/1	0	03	40
	436/2	0	03	25
	439/3	0	00	95
	439/4	0	01	95
	439/35	0	01	95
	439/36	0	00	95
	439/37	0	04	30
	439/38	0	05	20
	439/39	0	03	80
	439/44	0	09	80
	444/2B	0	23	45
	444/3	0	09	85
	444/5	0	11	75
	444/7	0	13	35
	445/1	0	03	10
	445/2	0	01	80
	445/3	0	02	00
	445/5	0	02	35
	465/1	0	09	25
	465/18	0	01	25
	465/19	0	02	55
	465/21	0	00	75
	465/22	0	03	60
	465/23	0	02	35
	465/25	0	08	80
	465/26	0	02	25
	465/27	0	11	55
	465/28	0	09	40
	468	0	04	55

[F. No. L-14014/45/2002-G.P.]
S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.अ. 4422—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जेट एअरवेज लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, मुम्बई-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 14/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/62/1999-आई. आर. (सी-1)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 19th October, 2006

S.O. 4422—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 14/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Mumbai-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jet Airways Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-10-06.

[No. L-11012/62/1999-IR (C-I)]

S.S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 MUMBAI
PRESENT**

A. A. IAD, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-2/14 of 2000.

Employers in Relation to the management of :

JET AIRWAYS LIMITED

The General Manager H. R.,
Jet Airways, S. M. Centre,
Andheri- Kurla Road,
Andheri (East),
Mumbai-400 059.

AND

There Workman
Amrit Melant,
Beena, Flat No. 5,
Guru Gangeshwar Road, Khar,
Mumbai-400 052.

APPEARANCE :

For the Employer : Mr. Ms. Pooja Kulkarni, Abhay
Kulkarni & Associates,
Advocates.

For the Workmen : Mr. Haresh Shivdashani &
Ms. Hutoxi Taradia.
Mr. Anchan Advocates.

Date of Passing of Award : 3rd August, 2006

AWARD II

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-11012/62/99-IR (C-I) dated 4th February, 2000 in exercise of the powers conferred by of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Jet Airway Ltd., Mumbai in terminating the services of the Workman, Mr. Amrit Melant w.e.f. 24-2-1999 is justified ? If not, what relief, the workman, Shri Amrit Melant is entitled to ?"

2. To support the subject matter referred in the reference, 2nd Party filed Statement of Claim at Exhibit 6 narrating his history of employment with 1st Party and various developments took place during his tenure with 1st Party. He further states that, he was absent from 9th April, 1998. The show cause notice was issued by the 1st Party stating that, 2nd Party Workman remained absent from 9th April, 1998. It was replied by the 2nd Party. Even he reported for his duty on 24th July, 1998 where he was forced to sit idle and no work was provided to him. The charge sheet was served on him dated 24th July, 1998 alleging that, 2nd Party committed serious misconduct, unauthorisedly absenteeism was referred in the charge sheet. Enquiry was conducted. He attended it alongwith his representative. It is his case that said Enquiry was not conducted fairly and properly, and finding given by the Enquiry Officer were perverse. So he prayed to set aside the enquiry with directions to 1st Party to reinstate him with benefits of backwages and continuity of service.

3. This prayer of the 2nd Party was disputed by 1st Party by filing reply at exhibit 8 stating that, the 2nd Party was habitual in remaining absent from duty. He was absent unauthorisedly. Charge sheet was served. Enquiry was conducted. Opportunity was given to the 2nd Party. Relying on that, findings were given by the Enquiry Officer holding him guilty of the charges levelled against him. Disciplinary Authority accepted the finding of the Enquiry Officer and given punishment.

4. In view of the above pleadings my Ld. Predecessor framed Issues at Exhibit 13. Out of them Issue No. 1 and 2 were decided as preliminary Issue by passing Part I Award on 25th June, 2003.

5. So now remaining Issues i. e. Issue No. 3 to 5 are taken for decision which I answers as follows :—

Issues**Findings**

3. Whether management of M/s. Jet Airways Prove that the workman remained unauthorisedly absent for a period of 108 days which amounts to gross misconduct ?

Yes

4. Whether the action of the management of M/s. Jet Airways Ltd., Mumbai in terminating the services of the workman, Mr. Amrit Melant w.e.f. 24-2-1999 is Justified ? Yes
5. What relief Mr. Amrit Melant is entitled to ? Does not survive.

REASONS :

Issue No. 3 to 5 :

6. To support the case i.e. punishment is proportionate it is pertinent to note that, 1st Party submitted documents viz. copies of enquiry proceedings. When matter was posted for deciding Part II Award i. e. on the quantum of punishment, by filing Exhibit 38, Advocate for the 2nd Party submit that, he wants to withdraw from the proceedings and he has intimated accordingly to the 2nd Party. It is pertinent to note that till then 2nd Party does not take care to appear, engage an Advocate and lead evidence.

7. This reveals that, 2nd Party does not want to participate on the Part II Award of reference which is on the quantum of punishment. Punishment is given to the 2nd Party of dismissal dated 24th February, 1999. When 2nd Party is not challenging the dismissal by attending reference and when his Advocate has informed accordingly to him as well as informed to this Court that, he is withdrawing from the reference since 2nd Party is not responding him, no option remains with this Tribunal but to dispose off the Part II Award for want of prosecution. So I answer the above Issues accordingly and passing the following order :

ORDER

Reference is disposed off for want of prosecution.
Mumbai,
3rd August, 2006.

A. A. LAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4423.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार न्यू मेंगलोर पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय बेंगलूर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 37/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-45011/1/2005-आई आर (बी-II)]
सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th October, 2006

S.O. 4423—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 37/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of New Mangalore Port Trust and their workman, received by the Central Government on 19-10-2006.

[No. L-45011/1/2005-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BANGALORE**

DATED : 28th September, 2006

PRESENT : Shri A. R. Siddiqui,
Presiding Officer

C. R. No. 37/2005

I Party

The General Secretary,
New Mangalore Port &
Dock Workers Union,
Market Building, Panambur,
Mangalore-575010.

II Party

The Chairman,
New Mangalore Port
Trust, Panambur,
Mangalore-575010.

APPEARANCES :

I Party : Shri V P Ashirwad
General Secretary

II Party : Shri Ramesh Upadhyaya
Advocate

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide Order No. L-45011/1/2005-IR(B-II) dated 29-08-2005 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of New Mangalore Port Trust in denying promotion to Shri a Ananda, Gestetner Operator, to the post of Record Keeper is legal and justified? If not, to what relief he is entitled ?"

2. When the matter stood for Claim Statement, it was taken up before the Lok-Adalat and both the parties appeared and have settled the matter out of court and filed a Memo to pass award accordingly in terms of the said memo, Hence, the following award.

3. Reference is partly allowed in terms of the Memo as under :

"Since the workman Sri A. Ananda had been promoted to the post of Record Keeper. Hence, I am not pressing the dispute of the workman."

(Dictated to LDC, transcribed by him, corrected and signed by me on 28th September, 2006)

A R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4424—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार विजया बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, लखनऊ के पंचट (संदर्भ संख्या 170/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/120/2000-आई आर (बी-II)]

सौ. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th October, 2006

S.O. 4424 —In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 170/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Vijaya Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-10-2006.

[No. L-12012/120/2000-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
LUCKNOW

PRESENT

Shrikant Shukla, Presiding Officer

I. D. No. 170/2000

Ref. No. L. 12012/128/2000/IR (B-II)

Dt. 18-10-2000

Between

U. P. Bank Workers Organization
Mathura Nagar, Aligarh-202001

And

Vijaya Bank,
The Dy. General Manager,
Vijaya Bank,
17 Barakhambha Road,
New Delhi.

AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi referred the following dispute vide No. L-12012/128/2000/IR (B-II) dated 18-10-2000 for adjudication

to the Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow:

"Whether the action of General Manager, Vijaya Bank, New Delhi in dismissing the services of Sri S. A. H. Kirmani vide order dated 1-9-97 passed by the disciplinary authority is legal and justified? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

It is admitted fact of the parties that the worker Sri S. A. H. Kirmani (hereinafter be called as worker) was posted as Armed Guard and was served with the charge-sheet dt. 30-5-96 the contents of which is reproduced below :

1. आप द्वारा लगातार चिकित्सा आधार पर अपने उच्च अधिकारियों के आदेशों की अवहेलना कर दिनांक 25-11-89 से लगातार बन्दूक उठाने से मना करने और सशस्त्र प्रहरी की ड्यूटी न करने से आपने जानबूझकर प्रबंधन/उच्च अधिकारियों के विधि सम्मत विवेकपूर्ण अनुदेशों की अवज्ञा और अवहेलना की है, जोकि द्विपक्षीय समझौते 1966 के अध्याय 19 की धारा 19.5 की उपधारा (ई) के अन्तर्गत "घोर कदाचार" है।

2. उच्च अधिकारियों के विधि सम्मत आदेशों को चिकित्सा आधार पर बहाना बना कर अवहेलना करने और जुलाई, 1994 तक सशस्त्र प्रहरी के लिये विशेष भत्ता प्राप्त करने के बावजूद दि. 25-11-89 से बन्दूक न उठाकर सशस्त्र प्रहरी की ड्यूटी न करने की कार्यवाही से आपने शाखा को खतरे में डाला है और बैंक के हित के प्रतिकूल कार्यवाही की है, जोकि द्विपक्षीय समझौते के अध्याय 19 की धारा 19.5 की उपधाराओं (जे) के अंतर्गत "घोर कदाचार" है।

3. आप द्वारा चिकित्सा आधार पर बहाना बना कर अपने उच्च अधिकारियों के आदेशों की अवहेलना दि. 25-11-89 से बन्दूक उठाकर सशस्त्र प्रहरी के कर्तव्य न करना और शाखा में बेकार बैठे रहना, जिससे शाखा की सुरक्षा खतरे में पड़ी है इसे कार्य के निष्पादन में जानबूझ कर मंदता लाना माना गया है जोकि द्विपक्षीय समझौते 1966 के अध्याय 19 की धारा 19.5 की उपधारा (जी) के अंतर्गत "घोर कदाचार" है।

4. उपर्युक्त 4 अवसरों पर कार्यालय समय से पहले उपस्थित का दावा किये जाने के उद्देश्य से हस्ताक्षर करने के बाद बिना शाखाध्यक्ष की सूचना/अनुमति से शाखा के बाहर निकलने और पूरे दिन शाखा से अनुपस्थित रहने और दिन की अनुपस्थिति के लिये कोई छुट्टी आवेदन पत्र न भेजने की आपकी कार्यवाही बैंक के हित के प्रतिकूल है जो कि द्विपक्षीय समझौते 1966 के अध्याय 19.5 की उपधारा (जे) के अन्तर्गत "घोर कदाचार" है।

5. आपने अपने स्वामित्व की संस्था मै. मोडेस्ट फर्नीचर लाक, अलीगढ़ की इकाई का संचालन किया जिसके लिये आपने उतर प्रदेश वित्तीय निगम, अलीगढ़ एवं यूनियन बैंक इण्डिया, अलीगढ़ को गलत सूचना देकर/सूचना छिपाकर धोखे से ऋण प्राप्त किया और विजया बैंक में अपनी ड्यूटी/सेवाओं के अतिरिक्त निजी लाभकारी

व्यवसाय किया जोकि द्विपक्षीय समझौते 1966 के अध्याय 19 की धारा 19.5 की उपधारा (ए) के अंतर्गत “घोर कदाचार” है।

Enquiry was conducted by the enquiry officer and the same was submitted to disciplinary authority and the worker was dismissed from bank's services and the worker has requested that the enquiry proceedings were defective and therefore dismissal order be set aside.

The worker's case is that enquiry was conducted in violation of principles of natural justice and the opposite party denied the allegations of the worker therefore this issue has been preliminarily decided by this court vide its order dt. 27-7-05 concluding that the enquiry was not just and fair. The Presiding Officer of the court directed the opposite party to produce its evidence on the said charges.

The opposite party has filed photo copies of the documents along with application C-64:

1. Letter dated 14-2-95/17-2-95 complaint of Branch Manager against Sri S.A.H. Kirmani regarding non-performance of his duties and irregular attendance dt. 14-2-05/17-2-05.
2. Preliminary investigation report dt. 25-4-96 submitted by Capt. R. Chaturvedi, Security Officer, Regional Office, Lucknow to the Asstt. General Manager, Regional Office, Lucknow.
3. Copy of punishment order dt. 24-2-89 for misconduct against Sri S.A.H. Kirmani the workman awarding censure for committing misconduct.
4. Copy of punishment order dt. 31-10-91 for committing misconduct against Sri SAH Kirmani the workman awarding stoppage of one increment permanently.
5. Copy of charge sheet dt. 30-5-96 (Hindi version).
6. Copy of letter of Union Bank of India, Patthar Bazar Branch, Aligarh dt. 22-4-96 regarding availing of commercial loan by Sri S.A.H. Kirmani for Rs. one lakh.
7. Copy of loan sanctioned letter dt. 22-4-96 availed by sri S.A.H. Kirmani as prop. of M/s Modest Furniture Lock dt. 22-4-96 along with various enclosures—loan application affidavit.

The opposite party has examined Sri R.Chaturvedi on 17-11-05. Sri P. Chaughan, Asstt. Manager on dated 17-11-05 and Sri D. K. Verma on 19-1-06. The worker has not produced any evidence in his defence.

After careful perusal of statement of claim and rejoinder of trade union following 3 facts have been narrated. In fact the enquiry was concluded at 12.45 PM on 30-11-96 thereafter the P.O. has submitted his written brief along with 19 additional documents which were not produced during the enquiry proceedings on 13-12-96. On

16-12-96 the defence had submitted his written brief objecting the submission of additional documents. The enquiry officer submitted his report to the disciplinary authority on 7-2-97.

The disciplinary authority directed the enquiry officer to reopen the enquiry proceeding for the specific purpose of production of the said additional documents on 15-03-97.

The worker has alleged that bank with malafide intention chargesheeted him.

It is noteworthy that the worker has filed following documents in support of his case along with rejoinder:

1. Enquiry proceedings.
2. Reply of the bank before ALC(C) Kanpur.
3. Enquiry proceedings dt. 24-4-97.
4. Request letter of Mr. Kirmani dt. 24-4-97 along with medical certificate.
5. Enquiry proceeding dt. 25-4-97.
6. Request letter of Mr. Kirmani dt. 6-5-97 along with medical certificate.
7. Medical certificate dt. 16-12-89.
8. The letter of Aligarh branch Manager dt. 10-3-95.
9. The letter of Aligarh branch manager dt. 30-4-96.
10. Letter of Mr. Kirmani dt. 2-5-96.
11. Letter of branch manager Aligarh dt. 2-5-96.
12. Copy of licence of the gun of Aligarh branch.
13. Letter of Mr. Kirmani dt. 29-3-89.
14. Letter of Mr. Kirmani dt. 8-8-95.
15. Report of investigation officer dt. 25-4-96.

Opposite party has filed following documents along with list paper No. 7/2 to 7/4:

1. Copy of letter of disciplinary authority dt. 1-9-97 imposing the punishment of dismissal from the services of the bank with immediate effect.
2. Copy of letter dt. 27-6-97 of Disciplinary authority communicating the proposed punishment to Sri S.A.H Kirmani.
3. Copy of representation submitted by Sri SAH Kirmani dt. 30-8-97.
4. Copy of proceedings dt. 30-8-97.
5. Copy of representation submitted by Sri S.A.H Kirmani dt. 12-5-97
6. Copy of enquiry findings dt. 18-6-97 submitted by enquiry officer in duplicate.
7. Written brief of presenting officer dt. 8-5-97.

8. Copy of enquiry proceedings held on 24-4-97 in terms of notice dt. 2-4-97.
9. Letter dt. 15-3-97 of disciplinary authority reopening of enquiry.
10. Copy of enquiry proceedings held on 25-4-97.
11. Copy of enquiry proceedings held on 6-5-97
12. Copy of enquiry proceedings with regard to the enquiry from 26-11-96 to 30-11-96.
13. Notices dt. 14-11-96, 28-10-96 and 7-10-96 from enquiry officer to Mr. Kirmani.
14. Copies of management exhibits
15. Copies of defence exhibits
16. Copies of defence exhibits
17. Letter dt. 7-8-86 appointing presenting officer.
18. Letter dated 7-8-96 appointing enquiry officer.
19. Letter dt. 30-5-96 of suspension.
20. Copy of charge sheet bearing No. DZ: IRD:35:96 dt. 30-5-96
21. Written brief of presenting officer dt. 13-12-96 alongwith annexures.
22. Objections of the defence representative dt. 26-12-96.
23. Copy of relevant portion of Bipartite Settlement.
24. Zerox of certified true copy of order passed by Hon'ble High Court, Allahabad in W. P. No. 15358 of 99.

Heard arguments on behalf of the parties. Learned representative of the trade union has argued that the opposite party produced list of 5 witnesses but they have examined only one witness Capt. R. Chaturvedi in the court who has supported his investigation report and has stated in the cross examination that he has proposed punishment in his investigation report. Capt. Chaturvedi has also stated that he did not appear in the departmental enquiry as management witness. Thus, the officer who conducted the enquiry (investigation) has gone out of jurisdiction and has proposed the punishment to be inflicted to the worker. This shows that he was prejudiced with the worker and that investigation report itself is not trustworthy on the basis of which the charge sheet was issued to the worker. The representative of the trade union has also argued that Capt. Chaturvedi appeared before the departmental enquiry as management witness and therefore he is not trustworthy witness and he has given a false statement. Second witness which has been produced by the management Sri P. Chaugan is not in the list of witnesses produced by the management and no permission has been taken by the management for examining him and therefore his evidence can not be read. It is further argued that Sri D.K. Verma has been examined with the permission of the court further his

name was also not included in the list of witnesses. Sri Verma has stated, in his evidence that he knows Sri SAH Kirmani well. The witness has also stated that he brought paper No. 84/2 and 84/3 from UP Financial Corpn. And Union Bank of India, Aligarh. Sri Verma has not stated that he has worked with the worker in any branch therefore how he could know the worker well is not to be believed. Sri Verma has stated in the cross examination that he brought documents C-84/2 and C 84/3 and both were written before, him on, 10-1-96 whereas paper No. C-84/2 is dt. 6-1-06 and C-84/3 is dt. 3-1-2006. Sri Verma has also stated in his examination that he is known to the signatories of both the document.

The representative of the worker has stated that if for the argument sake we believe his statement then in that case the findings shall be that the documents dt. 3-1-06 and 6-1-06 were written before Sri Verma on 10-1-06 as such it is not possible. Sri Verma is speaking a lie and therefore it is to be believed that these documents were not written before witness and the witness is not known to signatories and both the documents have not been proved by the management.

It is also argued on behalf of the worker at Sl. No.3 of the list of name of Ved Prakash. Asstt. Branch Manager., Aligarh branch and Sl. No.5 Sri N.K. Sharma. Clerk, Aligarh is mentioned and he can say with confidence that at that time there was no Asstt. Manager as Ved Prakash nor was any clerk as Sri N.K. Sharma. Opposite party has tried to mislead to the court. The opposite party has also not produced the original copy of which has been produced by the worker. It has therefore been said that the opposite party has failed to prove the charge levelled against the worker.

It is argued on behalf of the trade union that direction of the court the first four charges have not proved and no evidence have been produced in this court. It is stated that the worker was appointed as Armed Guard in the Aligarh branch of the bank and all of sudden in 1989 he experienced pain in his back due to this he found it difficult to stand with the Gun and on 22-8-89 worker requested the bank that he should be appoint as Peon in the bank and the Bank vide its letter dt. 24-10-89 directed the worker that he should get the medical certificate from medical officer of Government Hospital and produce. The worker contacted the Chief Medical officer of the district hospital and as per his direction the Chief Medical Superintendent examined the worker and on 16-12-1989 he issued a medical certificate for Low Backache and also reported that he is not fit for Armed Guard duty. The worker once again requested the bank that he should be posted as Peon and the worker was asked on 3-8-90 that whether he is willing to work in any other branch of the bank., The worker in his reply stated that he may be posted any of the branch situated in Aligarh. The management of the bank did not dispose of the representation of the worker. Instead bank took the decision

of the application of the worker for further medical check up in medical college and worker complied with the order but with no result. During this period in short intervals worker continuously requested the opposite party that he should be asked to work as Peon and also requested to the management vide dt. 13-3-90 that in case the bank does not accept his request then his resignation be accepted because he is not able to perform his duty of armed guard and accordingly the worker has been performing his duty without Arm. The Branch Manager, Aligarh vide has order dt. 10-3-95 directed the worker to work as Peon and worker has been accordingly performing the duty of peon. The bank management again order on 20-4-96 for the medical check up of the worker in district hospital along with the officer of the Bank. The medical officer of the District Hospital declared the worker fit for Armed Guard duty. But it was stated that medical certificate dt. 16-12-89 was false. The branch manager, Aligarh directed the worker on 30-4-96 to perform his duty as Armed Guard and when worker demanded for the gun then it revealed that the gun licence has not been renewed after 31-12-93.

It is strongly argued that Capt. R. Chaturvedi recommended immediate suspension of the worker & subsequently dismissed from the bank and the bank management accordingly agreed to the recommendation of Capt. Chaturvedi and the worker was suspended and was later on dismissed after charge sheet.

It is noteworthy that whatever the representative of the trade union has argued in this court the same has not been pleaded in the statement of claim. It is also noteworthy that trade union has not produced any witness in support of his argument.

The representative of the opposite party has argued that Sri Verma has not been questioned in the cross examination as to how he knew the worker. He has drawn the attention of the Presiding Officer on the cross examination wherein Sri D.K. Verma has stated in cross examination which is re-produced below :

“इन दोनों पत्रों को मैं यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, अलीगढ़ तथा UPFC, अलीगढ़ से लाया मैं इन पत्रों को 10-1-06 को लाया यह पत्र मेरे सामने लिखे गये।”

“C-84/2 को देखकर यह बताया कि 6-1-06 को लिखा।”

“84/3 दिनांक 3-1-06 को लिखा है। यह दोनों पत्र शाखा प्रबन्धक, विजया बैंक से सम्बन्धित है। इन दोनों पत्रों के हस्ताक्षरकर्ता से मैं परिचित नहीं हूँ।”

The representative of the opposite party has argued that no where witness has been asked as to whether he went to UP Financial Corpn. on 6-1-06 and Union Bank of India on 3-1-06. Witness has stated that he brought these documents from UP Financial Corpn. and Union Bank of India, Aligarh. Had he been asked he could have explain as to whether he went on 6-1-06 and 3-1-06 are not. No

where the worker has denied that he has not taken loan from UP Financial Corpn. or Union Bank of India, Aligarh. C-84/2 is the document which is with reference to letter of Vijaya Bank dt. 3-1-06 regarding M/s Modest Furniture Lock, Aligarh owned by Mr. SAH Kirmani. UP Financial Corpn has informed that an amount of Rs. 47000/- towards principal and Rs. 23,566 towards interest and Rs. 2230 towards expenses are due as on 15-10-05 over the said firm. It is also informed to the bank that they have issued recovery certificate to recover the public money and Vijaya Bank has been requested for cooperation.

Union Bank of India, Aligarh has also written a letter to the Vijaya Bank, that Sri SAH Kirmani had availed credit facility from Union Bank of India to the tune of Rs. one lakh on 26-10-93 under SSI. Loan amount stands fully deposited on 21-6-96 and currently bank has no claim position. As have been stated that there has been no denial from the worker that Bank of India, Aligarh therefore the representative of the opposite party has argued that while in service the worker Sri SAH Kirmani engaged himself in running industry. Sri P. Chaugan the then Asstt. Manager during the period 17-3-92 to 8-7-96 has stated that paper C78/1 and 78/2 is photo copy of that affidavit in which the worker has not disclosed his services in the bank and declared himself as unemployed soldier and accordingly obtained the loan. Paper No. C-78 is the certified true copy of the affidavit which reveals that affidavit was given by Sri SAH Kirmani stating that he is sole proprietor of Modest Furniture Lock, Aligarh the borrower concerned is not the employee of State Govt. nor he is employee of any institute controlled by the State Govt. at present but the borrower is ex-serviceman retired from the Military. UP Financial Corpn. vide their letter of Nov. 1996 has informed the Branch Manager, Vijaya Bank, Aligarh in response to their letter dt. 22-4-96 and meeting with the officers of Vijaya Bank and Capt. R. Chaturvedi, Regional Security officer of the Vijaya Bank, Lucknow regarding recovery from Sri SAH Kirmani proprietor of the unit. Wherein it has been informed to the Vijaya Bank that Sri SAH Kirmani has already taken a loan of Rs. 1.70 and Rs. 0.47 lakhs under SEMFEX Scheme for setting up furniture lock manufacturing unit vide sanctioned advice dt. 26-7-91. He has also drawn my attention on C-74 to 75 and 76.

Opposite party's representative drawn my attention to paper No. C-73 that UP Financial corpn. has informed the Vijaya Bank that various loans were sanctioned to proprietor to M/s Modest furniture Lock, Aligarh.

The worker has been charged for illegal and unauthorisedly running the business while in the service of the bank and specific charges were levelled against him. There is no denial of any kind from the worker that he did carry out the business in the name of firms which he was proprietor.

Paper No. 7/17 a application of Sri SAH Kirmani is on recording which Sri SAH Kirmani has requested the

management of Vijaya Bank on 30-8-97 that he will clear all dues. I have perused all documents carefully and it is proved that worker during the service carried out the business. The charge No.5 is very specifically that the worker concealing the fact of employment in the bank committed fraud in obtaining loan for running the business.

Referring to the argument forwarded by the representative of the worker about submitting of proposal by Capt. R. Chaturvedi in primary investigation. Opposite party's representative has argued that Capt. Chaturvedi is ex-army officer. He is straight forward in his working. As Security officer he found that Sri Sah Kirmani is unbecoming Armed Guard in the bank and therefore he should be suspended appears to be quite convincing. He is not disciplinary authority therefore whatever he had to convey he conveyed. It is for the disciplinary authority to take appropriate action there is no question of any prejudice with the worker. He has further argued that there is no personnel enmity with Sri Sah Kirmani. There is no explanation as to why he should be prejudiced with the worker who are ex-army man.

Capt. Chaturvedi has stated in examination in chief that he knows Shri. Sah Kirmani who was armed guard in Aligarh branch of the bank. He has also proved that various complaint he has been receiving that Sri Kirmani is not performing duty properly. He proved C-66 and stated that C-66 is letter dt. 17-2-95 of Aligarh branch. This letter was sent to Regional Office which was regarding non performing of duty and irregular attendance of Sri Kirmani. It is written in the letter that the worker is in habit of disobedience. A explanation was called from him but the worker failed to give the explanation. In the same letter it is also mentioned that the worker was sanctioned mortgage loan Rs. 26,250/- vide sanction order dt. 25-10-94 which is pending for release. Capt. Chaturvedi has also stated that on getting the letter he was directed to investigate the facts and accordingly he visited to Aligarh on 19-4-96 and on 22-4-96 he took Sri Kirmani to medical examination in district hospital Aligarh alongwith Sri Chaughan for medical check up and he has stated that paper No. 7/106 is medical certificate issued by hospital. This certificate shows that the worker Sri Kirmani was found fit for Armed Guard duty after his examination on 20-4-96.

In case the name of Sri P. Chaughan was not in the list of the witnesses. It matters a little Sri P. Chaughan was also material witness in the case. Sri P. Chaughan was Asstt. Mgr. during the period 17-2-92 to 18-7-96 and the witness has proved that Sri Kirmani was not performing the duty of Armed Guard. He has also stated that he was not performing the duties regularly and sometime he use to come late similarly he use to leave the bank during the working hours thereafter he use to return back without taking any permission. He has also stated that inspite of instructions from the Armed Guard he was not performing the duty of Armed Guard. He has proved that photo copies of 7/112, 7/

113, 119 Paper No. 7/111 is the letter of Sri Kirmani addressed to Branch Manager about absence which has written explaining the reasons for his leaving from premises on 30-1-95 the explanation he gave is that he went to fetch medicine. In the same application he has restrained Branch Manager for not to write letter to him in future. 7/112 is another letter issued by the Branch Manager to the worker for late arrival and early departure. Vide this letter of 23-1-95 branch manager asked him as to why disciplinary action not taken against him. 7/113 is letter of Branch Manager for early departure. 7/114 is letter of branch manager for early departure. 7/115 is the letter of worker wherein he has denied the allegations. Vide letter dt. 24-2-89 paper C-68 Sri Sah Kirmani was given punishment of censure for gross misconduct for disobedient of lawful orders of the branch manager for not wearing uniform provided by the bank. Sri P. Chaughan has also proved that worker was punished by order dt. 31-10-91 for misconduct for remaining unauthorized absence on various occasions. Inspite of instructions of the branch manager and for doing act prejudicial to the interest of the bank. He has also stated that worker has not informed the bank management for taking loans from the financial institutions and the bank had argued for information from the relevant financial institutions. No where in the cross examination it has been suggested on behalf of the trade union that the worker gave the information to the management of bank for obtaining loan from other financial institutions and for running the industry. The statement of Sri P. Chaughan can not be brushed aside merely because his name was not in the list of witnesses.

On the discussions above I come to the conclusion. that the worker wilfully disobeyed the orders of superiors and insisted the management to change his trade from Armed Guard to the peon even if it is taken to be true that the gun's licence was not renewed by the worker was expected to work as Guard only. He could have even then performed the duties of the Guard instead of pressing of change in trade. His leaving the work premises could have endangered the security of the bank. It is also proved that he obtained loan from other banks in carrying on the business. Concealing the facts that he was bank's employee. In the circumstances all charges stands proved.

So far as the question of punishment is concerned a employee who is entrusted with the duty of protection of bank if wilfully disobeyed the orders of superiors and if on his own slips away from the bank can be dangerous to security of the bank. It is expected from the retired army man to be duty full, towards his duty and i.e. reasons the bank's appoint these ex-servicemen to protect the bank if they starts disobeyed the orders and slip away from the bank unauthorisedly can not be permitted in larger interest of the bank. It is shocking that an employee does not take any interest in the working of the bank and obtains loan for running the industry. The explanation given by the trade

union are not convincing for any sympathetic view in the matter. He has availed a lot of loan and he is running the industry and therefore in fitness of the case his removal from the services is justified. The worker is not entitled for any relief.

LUCKNOW

4-10-2006 SHRIKANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4425.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इलाहाबाद बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 44/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/220/1998-आई. आर. (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th October, 2006

S.O. 4425.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 44/99) of the Central Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur (U.P.) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Allahabad Bank and their workman, received by the Central Government on 19-10-06.

[No. L-12012/220/1998-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SURESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR, U. P.

Industrial Dispute No. 44 of 99

In the matter of dispute between :

Sh R. B. Chaubey,
President
Allahabad Bank Staff Association
C/o Allahabad Bank Kamachcha Branch,
Varanasi.

And

The Assistant General Manager,
Allahabad Bank Taksal Theatre Building
Nadesar, Varanasi.

AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi vide its notification No. L-12012/220/98/IR (B-II) dated 22-2-99/9-3-99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Allahabad Bank in dismissing Sri Panna Lal from the service of the bank is justified and whether he

is entitled for reinstatement with back wages and other consequential benefits. If not what relief he is entitled for ?”

2. It is quite unnecessary to give full facts of the case as from the perusal of the reference order it is obvious that there is no mention of date of termination of the services of the workman. In case the tribunal comes at a conclusion that the action of the management in dismissing the services of the workman is neither legal nor justified a normal question which arises for consideration is as to from what date workman be allowed the relief of reinstatement. Therefore, in view of position explained above, the reference order has become redundant and on the basis of vague reference workman cannot be granted any relief of any nature what to say about reinstatement. Reference is, therefore, answered accordingly against the workman and in favour of the bank.

SURESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4426.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ बड़ोदा के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 179/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/369/1997-आई. आर. (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th October, 2006

S.O. 4426.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 179/98) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur (U. P.) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Bank of Baroda and their workman, received by the Central Government on 19-10-2006.

[No. L-12012/369/1997-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SURESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 179 of 1998

In the matter of dispute between :

Bank of Baroda Staff Association,
The General Secretary BOBSA,
Madhav Bhavan,
15/222-A Civil Lines,
Kanpur.

AND

Bank of Baroda,
The Regional Manager,
BOB Regional Office,
Lodhwari Kothi, Civil Lines Road,
Rae Bareilly U. P.

AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi vide its notification No. L-12012/369/97/IR (B-I) dated 20-10-1998 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of Baroda in not confirming Sri Ram Lal, Part time sweeper in the Bank service is justified? If not whether he is entitled for permanency from the back date with all consequential benefits or some other relief?”

2. It is unnecessary to give full facts of the case as from the perusal of reference order it is quite clear that there is no mention of date in the Schedule of reference order regarding confirming the services of the workman. In case after the appraisal of evidence and facts of the case the Tribunal is of the opinion that the action of the management in not confirming the workman is neither legal nor justified then normal question for consideration which arises is as to from what date the relief claimed by the workman be granted. Therefore, in the absence of date in the Schedule of reference order workman cannot be granted any relief on the basis of vague reference order. Therefore, it is held that the reference order has become redundant and cannot be answered. Reference is answered accordingly.

SURESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4427.-औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंध निोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्विष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 37/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/124/2004-आई आर (सी एम- II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd October, 2006

S.O. 4427.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 37/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of M/s. Eastern

Coalfields Limited and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-10-2006.

[No. L-22012/124/2004-IR (CM-II)]

AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
ASANSOL

PRESENT:

Sri Md. Sarfaraz Khan, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 37 of 2005

PARTIES: The Agent, Kottadih Project, Pandaveshwar
Area of E. C. L.

Vrs.

The Joint General Secretary, Ukhra Colliery
Mazdoor Union (INTUC), Ukhra, Burdwan.

REPRESENTATIVES:

For the management : Sri P. K. Das, Advocate

For the union (Workman): Sri Sushil Banerjee, Advocate.

INDUSTRY: COAL STATE: WEST BENGAL

Dated the 18th August, 2006.

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), Govt. of India through the Ministry of Labour vide its letter No. L-22012/124/2004-IR (CM-II) dated 10-05-2005 has been pleased to refer the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Kottadih Project under Pandaveshwar Area of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Limited in denying conversion in Time Rate with pay protection and consequential benefits to Mr. Gandhi Bagdi, Driller, U.M. No. 721532 and 9 others (list enclosed) w.e.f. 27-4-2000 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?”

On having received the Order No. L-22012/124/2004-IR (CM-II) dated 10-05-2005 from the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for adjudication of the dispute, a reference case No. 37 of 2005 was registered on 31-05-2005 and accordingly an order to that effect was passed to issue notices to the respective parties through the registered post directing them to appear in the court on the scheduled date and file their written statement along with the documents and a list of witnesses in support of their claims. Pursuant to the said order notices were issued to the parties concerned and Sri P. K. Das, Advocate

appeared in the court along with a letter of authority duly issued by the competent authority to represent the management. Similarly Sri Sushil Banerjee appeared for the union along with a letter of authority duly issued by C.S. Banerjee General Secretary Ukhra Colliery Mazdoor Union (Burdwan). Both the representatives prayed for time to file their written statement which was allowed fixing 5-09-05 for the same.

From perusal of the record it transpires that both the parties remained absent on the next fixed date. It is further clear from the order sheets of the record that none of the parties filed their written statement. The union's representatives left taking any step on its behalf since 5-09-05 to 18-08-06. The regular absence of the union in spite of several adjournments itself indicates that the union has got no interest and does not want to proceed with the case further. In such circumstance it is not advisable to keep the record pending any more as no useful purpose is to be served. As such it is hereby

ORDERED

That let a "No Dispute Award" be and the same is passed. Send the copies of the award to the Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi for information and needful. The reference is accordingly disposed of.

MD. SARFARAZ KHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4428.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं. 1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 25/1995) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/323/94-आई आर (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd October, 2006

S.O. 4428.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 25/1995) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Punjab National Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-10-2006.

[No. L-12012/323/94-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH

Case No. ID 25/95

Shri Hari Singh

S/o Sh. Jit Singh

C/o Sh. M.L. Balecha,

Shiv Colony, Rly. Road,

V.P.O. Palwal, Distt. Faridabad, Haryana.

—Applicant

Versus

The Senior Manager,

Punjab National Bank,

Palwal, Distt. Faridabad, Haryana

—Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the Workman : Sh. Karam Singh

For the Management : Sh. Harjit Singh

AWARD

Passed on 25-8-2006

Central Govt. vide No.L 12012/323/94/IR/(B-II) dated 20-3-1994 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank. Palwal in terminating the services of Shri Hari Singh. Mini Deposit Collector w.e.f. 28-9-90 is legal and justified? If not, what relief is the said workman is entitled to?"

2. Workman filed claim statement stating that he was engaged as deposit clerk for collecting deposit from general public by moving shop to shop and house to house on the direction of the management w.e.f. 20-12-1977. He was also authorised by the management to open its saving scheme etc. and opening mini deposit account or General public with it and the workman was provided with certain facilities by the management. He was doing his work with the utmost satisfaction of his officers. During the anti reservation movement the record of the branch was burnt including the record concerning workman. The workman also helped the management for rebuilding the record. The management terminated his service on 28-9-90 without any reasons, enquiry warning. charge sheet etc. and without affording any opportunity to the workman and without holding any enquiry. He was not paid any retrenchment compensation. That other juniors appointed performing the same duties. That workman worked with the management and at the age of 40 years he can not join any Govt. service due to his overage. The workman raised the dispute before the ALC(C), but the management remained adamant and did not settle his case. Even the workman was not considered for his adjustment on some other post. He

prayed for his reinstatement to the post of deposit clerk with continuity of service and backwages or he may be adjusted to some other post suitable as per his qualification.

3. Management filed written statement denying allegations and submitted that he was a contractual mini deposit collector for the purpose of opening of mini deposit account, representative of the bank on commission basis in terms of the Mini Deposit Scheme in operation in the bank and he was never appointed as workman in the bank. During Sept. 1990 during the mob violence the record was destroyed and functioning of B.O. Palwal was stopped temporarily and the applicant was advised to stop accepting fresh deposits in the said scheme till the old accounts are settled. It is further submitted that there was no control of the bank over the applicant and he was under the supervisions of the bank and his compensation depended entirely upon the quantum of deposits collected by him and he was paid commission and not wages. It is further submitted that the applicant was never appointed in the bank as a workman, therefore, it is not a termination and as such neither any permission was required from the Govt. nor any compensation was payable to the applicant. It is also submitted that appointment procedure is different and it is done through banking service recruitment Board and there is no such procedure to appoint any person in the bank directly and the claim is devoid of any merits and deserves rejection.

4. There was no employer and employee relationship between the bank and the workman. The workman can not be reinstated as not entitled.

5. In this case both the parties filed their affidavits in evidence and workman examined himself as WWI and management examined MWI Ved Parkash Chaudhary. In evidence management witness has denied that bank employed mini deposit collector in their regular staff and any junior of Hari Ram was retained and that no mini deposit collector was appointed thereafter in the bank.

6. Both the parties filed their written arguments and thereafter advanced detailed oral arguments. In arguments both the parties are in agreement of the facts of the case that workman was engaged as mini deposit collector and that the record during the Sept. 1990 was destroyed in the fire. Both the parties relied mainly on judgement Indian Bank Association and Workmen or Syndicate Bank and others 2001-LLJ page 219. Earlier both the parties raised objections against each other submitting that petitioner is not a workman U/S 2(s) of the I.D. Act 1947 and there is no relationship of employer and employee and that petitioner admitted himself that he was taking commission and not salary/wages and the above referred judgement had decided all these points and also passed in the case of deposit collector like the present workman of the bank.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme court has held in the above judgment that deposit collectors of the bank i.e. workmen works as above and commission are received by them, which is nothing else but wage and there is master and servant relation existed between the deposit collector and concerned bank. Several appeals were filed against a judgment of the Hon'ble High court wherein directions of the Industrial Tribunal regarding payment of full back wages etc. to the deposit collectors of the banks was challenged. There was an appeal by the National Federation of Bank employees impugned portion of the same judgment whereunder the relief of absorption of deposit collectors as regular employees had been set aside by the High court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed all the appeals holding that on the basis of evidence before it the Tribunal had given the findings of fact that the deposit collectors were workmen within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and it could not be said that this finding was sustainable. The commission received by the deposit collector was nothing else but wage as defined in Section 2(r) of the I.D. Act and there was clearly a relationship, of master and servant between the deposit collector and the concerned bank.

8. Further as regard the dispute between the parties on which the management allegedly terminated the services that the workman did not cooperate in building the record of the branch after it was destroyed in mob fire. There is only an oral denial of the officer who was not working at the relevant time in the Palwal Branch and only deposition is of the workman who himself has deposed and disclosing the above fact that he helped in reconstruction of the burnt record on oath himself. In view of the above as the bank neither brought any witness who was working at that time who seen reconstructions of the record or any other witness in the presence of which the workman denied or refused to cooperate with the bank in reconstruction of the record. I hold that the workman has proved that after the destruction of record in Riots fire, the workman helped in reconstruction of the record.

9. Despite the submissions this judgement does not help fully to either party. Learned counsel for the workman submitted that workman is entitled for full backwages as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as he was a workman and there was employer and employee relationship between the parties. He submitted that workman can be appointed to a suitable post and he can be adjusted in some other branches since this branch has dropped the scheme. On the other hand the learned law officer on behalf of the management submitted that no junior to the workman was retained or allowed to work and this scheme was dropped after 1990 and this scheme was never revived. He submitted that as regard violation of Section 25F admittedly workman was doing his work without the control of the management at his wish and being a contractual employee, there was no question of complying the

provisions of Section 25F. It was also submitted on behalf of the management that compliance was otherwise not possible as workman used to get Commission on collection made by him and management was not paying any wages. Further that the workman can not be considered for adjustment in the bank and his case may be dismissed.

10. Therefore, in view of the above submissions and in view of the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court referred above, and relied by both the parties workman claims reinstatement or appointment to any suitable or other post in the bank without following the proper procedure. Contentions of learned counsel for the workman is that the workman in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F was not allowed to join and his services were terminated without compliance of provisions of Section 25-F of I.D. Act. No notice of termination and retrenchment was given. There was no compliance of Section 25-F but management say as it was not possible as workman was paid commission & not remuneration. Scheme was discontinued and not revised. I am of the considered view that the present scheme is not continuing in the Branch and that recruitment to other posts in Bank as per Rules can be only by due procedure.

11. In view of the above, I am of the considered view that there is no dispute between the parties and in view of the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court relied by both the parties that mini deposit collector petitioner workman is a workman and commission earned by him are wages. There is also no dispute that services of the workman were terminated without following the mandatory provisions of Section 25F. Regarding the contentions of retaining other, it was not pressed. It is also not disputed and admitted in affidavit of the management that workman was engaged as mini deposit collector at Branch Office Palwal in December 1987 and worked upto 27-2-90 when his services were terminated only on the ground that he did not cooperate in rebuilding/reconstruction of the record of the bank which I have held above that management produced no evidence that workman did not cooperate in rebuilding/reconstruction of the record and workman as I held above helped in reconstruction/rebuilding of the record. Here management submitted and taken a plea that workman was paid commission and that was not wages and therefore management could not complied the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act. Commission as wages are paid at a fixed rate on quantum of collection and therefore compensation can be calculated on past commission paid on average or on month basis. So ground taken by management for termination was not proved by management. As I have held above that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that Commission earned by mini deposit collector is a wages and therefore, non-compliance of mandatory provisions of Section 25-F or the I.D. Act makes the termination of the workman *void ab initio* and

non-est. Therefore, I hold further that order of termination of Hari Singh Mini Deposit Collector w.e.f. 28-9-90 is not legal and not justified.

12. Now to what relief the workman is entitled to? In this regard it is not disputed by both the parties that bank has discontinued the scheme and that as desired by the workman to adjust him to some other post as per his qualification, the bank has shown its inability that all post in the bank are to be filled by adopting Statutory Rules and due procedure and they can not appoint anyone otherwise. I am of the considered view that this court is also not empowered to a order to adjust him to some other post as per his qualification as all the posts in the banks are filled only by adopting due process and Statutory Rules. I also found that scheme has been discontinued and not in existence and it will be a futile exercise to order reinstatement of the workman on post as a mini deposit collector as he was on 28-9-90 at Punjab National Bank branch Palwal the post is not available. I have perused the judgment referred by both the parties of the Hon'ble Supreme Court 2001 (1) LLJ page 219-226 wherein on admitting that no question arises to direct absorption to department and there could be not such directions and such directions are beyond the reference.

13. As I have held above that the scheme was discontinued and not reviewed and that workman can not be appointed to some other post in the bank, now what relief can be granted to the workman. In this regard I refer and rely on the judgment of Hon'ble H.P. High Court in Punjab National Bank Vs. Shri D.D. Sharma and others decided on 28-8-06 in the case of this Tribunal's case, the Hon'ble H.P. High Court, relying on the division bench of the Delhi High Court in Delhi Transportation case Vs. Presiding Officer 2001-LLJ 714 and the judgment in Punjab Land Development and Reclamation Corporation Ltd. Chandigarh. The Hon'ble H.P. Court relying this judgement wherein it is held that the position therefore, is that the order terminating the services of the workman amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Act. Since the appellant has not complied with the provisions of Section 25F of the Act, the order of termination is *void ab initio* and inoperative. The only question that now remains to be determined is the relief to be granted to the workman. (Para 27) We find from the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in the 1970s and 1980s that reinstatement with back wages was the norm in cases where the termination of services of the workman was held operative. The decisions rendered in the 1990s, including the decision of the constitution Bench in the Punjab Land Development and Reclamation Corporation Ltd., Chandigarh seem to suggest that compensation in lieu of reinstatement and back wages is now the norm. In any case, since we are bound to follow the decision of the constitution Bench, we therefore conclude that reinstatement is not the inevitable consequence of quashing

an order of termination; compensation can be awarded in lieu of reinstatement and back wages.

14. In view of the above judgment of the Hon'ble H.P. High Court, in this Court's decided case and in Constitution Bench in Land Reclamation Cases and the decision of the Division Bench of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in 2000-1-LLJ 714. I am of the considered view that reinstatement is not the inevitable consequence of quashing the order of termination, compensation can be awarded in lieu of reinstatement and back wages.

15. In the present case as I have already held above the order of termination passed by the management is not just and legal in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. I am also of the considered view that there is no post of Mini Deposit Collector and the scheme was discontinued and the workman can not be adjusted on any other post in the bank as these posts are to be filled in accordance with due procedure and following statutory rules. So in the above peculiar circumstances although the workman is successful in his case, he is not entitled for reinstatement. As regard backwages, bank also shows its inability to calculate the back wages as workman was not getting wages but he was getting commission on the basis of collection made in mini deposit scheme. In the circumstances I have found that Hon'ble H.P. High Court in PNB Vs. D.D. Sharma (Supra) granted compensation to the workman in lieu of reinstatement and backwages. I am therefore, of the considered view that in the present case also compensation can be granted to the workman to meet the ends of justice and workman can not be reinstated and back wages can not be ascertained, the management shall pay the workman lump sum amount as compensation to the tune of Rs. 70000 in lieu of reinstatement and back wages. The reference is answered accordingly. Central Government be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh. RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4429.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 89/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/413/99-आईआर (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4429.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 89/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour

Court, No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/413/99-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1,
CHANDIGARH.

Case No. ID/89/2000

Sh. Inderjit Pal C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, President, Telecom Labour Union, Mohalla Hari Nagar, Lal Singh Basti Road, Bhatinda (Pb.).151001

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda (Punjab) 151001.

....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Government vide notification No. L-40012/413/99/IR (DU) dated 17-02-2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in terminating the services of Sh. Inderjit Pal is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Government be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh, RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-09-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4430.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या

161/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/466/99-आई आर (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4430.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 161/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/466/99-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH

Case No. ID 161/2000

Sh. Jaswinder Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, President, Telecom Labour Union, Mohalla Hari Nagar, Lal Singh Basti Road, Bhatinda (Pb.) 151001.

....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Hoshiarpur (Punjab) 152001.

....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar
For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006.

Central Government vide notification No. L-40012/466/99/IR (DU) dated 13-03-2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Hoshiarpur in ordering disengagement/terminating of services of Sh. Jaswinder Singh workman engaged through Contractor Sh. Ashok Kumar Sharma, w.e.f. 1-3-1999 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?”

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the

present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Government be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

28-09-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4431.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 201/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/106/2000-आई आर (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4431.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 201/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/106/2000-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH

Case No. ID 201/2000

Sh. Ranbir Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, President, Telecom Labour Union, Mohalla Hari Nagar, Lal Singh Basti Road, Bhatinda (Pb.) 151001

....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Hoshiarpur (Punjab) 152001

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar
For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Government vide notification No. L-40012/106/2000/IR (DU) dated 30-05-2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Hoshiarpur in ordering disengagement/terminating the services of Sh. Ranbir Singh a workman engaged through Contractor Sh. Ashok Kumar Sharma, w.e.f. 1-3-1999 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference *vide* his statement recorded on 21-9-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-9-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4432. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 205/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/29/2000-आई आर (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4432.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 205/2000) of the Central Government Industrial-Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/29/2000-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH

Case No. ID 205/2000

Sh. Satnam Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, President, Telecom Labour Union, Mohalla Hari Nagar, Lal Singh Basti Road, Bhatinda (Pb.) 151001.

...Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Hoshiarpur (Punjab) 152001.

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar
For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28/9/2006.

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/29/2000/IR (DU) dated 30-5-2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Hoshiarpur(Pb.) in ordering disengagement/terminating the services of Sh. Satnam Singh a workman engaged through Contractor Sh. Ashok Kumar Sharma, w.e.f. 1-3-1999 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference *vide* his statement recorded on 21-9-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-9-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4433. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 55/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/482/2000-आई आर (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4433.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 55/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/482/2000-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. ID 55/2001

Sh. Satvinder Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, President, Telecom
Labour Union, 27349, Lal Singh Basti Road, Bhatinda (Pb.)

....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Hoshiarpur
(Punjab) 152001

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28/9/2006.

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/482/2000/
IR (DU) dated 29-12-2000 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General
Manager, Telecom, Hoshiarpur in ordering
disengagement/terminating the services of
Sh. Satvinder Singh a workman engaged through
Contractor M/s. Ram Krishan Budhram, w.e.f.
28-9-1999 is just and legal ? If not, to what relief the
workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of
the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri
Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his
statement recorded on 21-9-2006. In view of the same, the
present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat.
Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-9-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4434. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947
का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार
विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के
बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक
अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-1, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या
59/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है; जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को
25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/487/2000-आईआर(डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4434. — In pursuance of Section 17 of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central
Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 59/2001)
of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour
Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the
Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the
management of Telecom Department and their workman,
which was received by the Central Government on
25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/487/2000-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. ID 59/2001

Sh. Tarsem Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, President, Telecom
Labour Union 27349, Lal Singh Basti Road, Bhatinda (Pb.).

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Hoshiarpur
(Punjab) 152001.

.....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28/9/2006.

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/487/2000/
IR (DU) dated 29-12-2000 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General
Manager, Telecom, Hoshiarpur in ordering
disengagement/termination of services of Sh. Tarsem
Singh a workman engaged through Contractor Ashok
Kumar Sharma w.e.f. 28-2-1999 is just and legal ? If
not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from
which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of
the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri
Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his
statement recorded on 21-10-2006. In view of the same, the
present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat.
Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh
28-09-2006.

Rajesh Kumar, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

क्र.अ. 4435.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 83/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/523/2000-आईआर(डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4435.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 83/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No.L-40012/523/2000-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH.**

Case No. ID 83/2001

Sh. Jaskiran Jadge S/o Sh. Balbir Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet,
President Telecom Labour Union, 27349, Lal Singh Basti
Road, Bhatinda (Pb.) 151001.

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Amritsar
(Punjab) 152001.

.....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28/9/2006.

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/523/2000/
IR (DU) dated 31-01-2000 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Amritsar in termination of the services of Sh. Jaskiran Jadge S/o Sh. Balbir Singh, is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kuamr withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh
28-09-2006.

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

क्र.अ. 4436.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 331/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/236/2001-आईआर(डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4436.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ref. No. 331/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No.L-40012/236/2001-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. ID 331/2001

Sh. Kulwant Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda (Pb.).

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Bhatinda
(Punjab) 151001.

.....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28/9/2006.

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/236/2001/IR (DU) dated 6-11-2001 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in termination the services of Sh. Kulwant Singh S/o Sh. Babu Singh, is just and legal ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-09-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4437.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 13/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/270/2001-आई.आर.(डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4437.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 13/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/270/2001-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH.

Case No. ID 13/2002

Sh. Bhola Singh C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda (Pb.) 151001

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., E-10 B
Building, Behind HPO, Bhatinda (Punjab) 151001.

.....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28/9/2006.

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/270/2001/IR (DU) dated 31-12-2001 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in terminating the services of Sh. Bhola Singh S/o Sh. Nathu Singh, workman w.c.f. 1/3/99 is just and legal ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-09-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4438.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 15/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/271/2001-आईआर(डीयू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4438.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 15/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/271/2001-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH.**

Case No. ID 15/2002

Sh. Ram Dev C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet, Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda (Pb.). 151001

....Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Telecom Department, 32,
Garden Road Sadar Bazar, Agra(U.P.) 282001

2. The General Manager, Telecom., E-10 B Building,
Behind HPO, Bhatinda (Punjab) 151001

....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/271/2001/
IR (DU) dated 31-12-2001 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of General
Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in terminating the
services of Sh. Ram Dev S/o Sh. Ram Asre, workman
w.e.f. 1-3-99 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the
workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of
the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri
Vijay Kuamr withdraw the present reference vide his
statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the
present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat.
Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.”

Chandigarh
28-09-2006.

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

क्र.आ. 4439.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947
का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार
विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के
बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक
अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या
107/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को
25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/18/2002-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4439.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central
Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 107/
2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure
in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation
to the management of Telecom Department and their
workman, which was received by the Central Government
on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/18/2002-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH.**

Case No. ID 107/2002

Sh. Gurnail Singh S/o Sh. Balour Singh, VPO Saldoke, Tehsil
Nihal Singh Wala, Moga.

...Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., Ferozepur

...Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/18/2002-
IR (DU) dated 7-06-2002 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the workman Sh. Gurnail Singh has worked
with SDE(G), Nihal Singh Wala, Moga? If so, whether
the action of the management of General Manager,

Telecom, Ferozepur in termination the services at Sh. Gurnail Singh S/o Sh. Balour Singh worker w.e.f. 23-06-2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kuamr withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-09-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4440.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 109/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/16/2002-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4440.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 109/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/16/2002-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH.

Case No. ID 109/2002

Sh. Harwinder Singh S/o Sh. Sadhu Singh, VPO Madihe Ke,
Tehsil Nihal Singh Wala, Moga.

...Applicant

Vernus

1. The General Manager, Deptt. of Telecom., BSNL,
Ferozepur

.. Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/16/2002/IR (DU) dated 5-06-2002 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the workman Sh. Gurnail Singh has worked with SDE(G), Nihal Singh Wala, Moga? If so, whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Ferozepur in termination the services of Sh. Harwinder Singh S/o Sh. Sadhu Singh worker w.e.f. 23-06-2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kuamr withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
28-09-2006.

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ. 4441.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय न.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 309/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/61/2004-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4441.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 309/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/61/2004-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH****Case No. ID 309/2004**

Sh. Tarsem Singh S/o Sh. Pal Singh Village & P.O. Khowali,
Tehsil Ajnala, Ram Tirath Road, Amritsar (Pb.).

... Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Telecom., BSNL, Deptt. of
Telecom, Ranjit Avenue, Amritsar (Punjab)

... Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD**Passed on 28-9-2006**

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/61/2004/
IR (DU) dated 8-11-2004 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of BSNL,
Amritsar in termination the services of Sh. Tarsem
Singh S/o Sh. Pal Singh, Ex-Labour w.e.f. 28-02-1999
is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman
is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of
the parties. The authorised representative of workman
Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his
statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the
present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat.
Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh **RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer**
28-09-2006

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

क्र.आ. 4442.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947
का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसार में, केन्द्रीय सरकार वृहत् संघ
विभाग के प्रबंधन के संघर्ष नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के
बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार
औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्राम न्यायालय नं.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पक्ष

(संदर्भ संख्या 11/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार
को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/126/2004-आई आर (डी. यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4442.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central
Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 11/
2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court No. 1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure
in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation
to the management of Telecom Department and their
workman, which was received by the Central Government
on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/126/2004-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH****Case No. I.D. 11/2005**

Sh. Sanjeev Kumar S/o Sh. Baldev Raj Village & Post
Office, NHRU Nagga,
Distt. Hoshiarpur (Pb.) Hoshiarpur.

... Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Telecom, Telecom, Hoshiarpur
(Punjab)

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: Sh. Vijay Kumar

For the management: Ms. Deepali Puri

AWARD**Passed on 28-9-2006**

Central Government vide notification No. L-40012/
126/2004 IR (DU) dated 4-1-2005 has referred the following
dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of the
GMTD, BSNL, Hoshiarpur in termination the services
of Sanjeev Kumar S/o Sh. Baldev Raj without
complying with the provisions of the ID Act, 1947
w.e.f. 28-2-1999 is just and legal? If not, to what relief
Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, Cable Jointer Telephone

Exchange, GMTD, Hoshiarpur is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference *vide* his statement recorded on 21-9-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Government be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh
28-09-2006.

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ 4443.-औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नं.-I चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 329/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/233/2001-आई आर (डी. यू.)]
सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4443.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 329/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No. 1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No.L-40012/233/2001-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-1,
CHANDIGARH.

Case No. I.D. 329/2001

Sh. Rakesh Kumar C/o Sh. N. K. Jeet, Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda (Pb) 1

... Applicant

Versus

1. The General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda
(Punjab) 151001

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: Sh. Vijay Kumar
For the management; Sh. G.C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Government *vide* notification No. L-40012/233/2001/IR (D.U) dated 6-11-2001 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom Bhatinda in terminating the services of Sh. Rakesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chuni Lal is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference *vide* his statement recorded on 21-9-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Government be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh.
28-09-2006.

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का.आ 4444.-औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 2, 3 एण्ड 4/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/387/99-आई आर (डी. यू.)]

[सं. एल-40012/388/99-आई आर (डी. यू.)]

[सं. एल-40012/389/99-आई आर (डी. यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4444.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 2, 3, & 4/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-

cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/387/99-IR (DU)]

[No. L-40012/388/99-IR (DU)]

[No. L-40012/389/99-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE-560022

Dated : 10th October 2006

PRESENT :

SHRI A.R. SIDDIQUI,
Presiding Officer

C.R. No. 2/2002

IPARTY

Shri M. Krishnappa,
S/o Manivenketappa,
Thaylur Post,
Mulbagal Taluk,
KOLAR-571440

IIPARTY

The District
Telecom Manager,
Telecom Department,
Kolar District,
KOLAR-571440

C. R. No. 3/2002

IPARTY

Shri Shivanna,
S/o Chinappa,
Thaylur Post,
Mulbagal Taluk,
KOLAR-571440

IIPARTY

The District Telecom
Manager,
Telecom Department,
Kolar District,
KOLAR-571440

C. R. No. 4/2002

IPARTY

Shri C.V. Venkataramappa,
S/o Venkateshappa,
Thaylur Post,
Mulbagal Taluk,
KOLAR-571440

IIPARTY

The District
Telecom Manager,
Telecom Department,
Kolar District,
KOLAR-571440

COMMON AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of the

Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred these disputes *vide* Order No. L-40012/387/99-IR(DU), No. L-40012/388/99-IR(DU) & No. L-40012/389/99-IR (DU) dated 2nd January 2002 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE (CR No 2/02)

“Whether the action of the management of District Telecom Engineer, Kolar in terminating the services of their workman Shri M. Krishnappa from July 1987 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

SCHEDULE (CR No 3/02)

“Whether the action of the management of District Telecom Engineer, Kolar in terminating the services of their workman Shri C. Shivanna from July 1987 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

SCHEDULE (CR No 42/02)

“Whether the action of the management of District Telecom Engineer, Kolar in terminating the services of their workman Shri C.V. Venkataramappa from July 1987 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The facts and point of law being common and the management being the party in all these 3 cases, they are taken together for disposal by common award for the purpose of convenience and to avoid overlapping of the decisions to be made in these cases.

3. The common grounds urged in the Claim statements, by way of documentary and oral evidence and the defence taken by the first party workmen in the cross examination of the management witnesses are that all of them had been working with the management joining their services of the Telecom Department at Kolar in the year 1985 as a Casual Labourers and worked there on Muster Roll till July 1987 and it is from the month of July 1987 onwards they have been refused work under the muster roll. Thereupon they were forced to work under permanent employee and were being paid through bills under ACJ account at the rate of Rs. 280 per month; that the payment through ACJ was also stopped from the year 1994 onwards to avoid documentary evidence showing the payment and it is since 1997 the workman in CR No. 2/02 has been working under the Lineman, Kaveriyappa at Thayalur, Mulbagal Taluk executing the work of telecom department being paid Rs. 600 monthly by the said Lineman, Kaveriyappa through the bills in turn being reimbursed by the department to the Lineman; that the workman in CR No. 3/02 has been working since 1996 under the said Lineman, Shri Narasimappa and he is being paid Rs. 600

monthly through the bills by the said lineman; that the workman in CR No. 4/02 has been working under the lineman, Shri Kaveriyappa being paid Rs. 600/- per month through bills. The workmen then contended that they have been agitating for giving work under muster roll & for regularizing their services and give them the benefits, of permanent employee since long, as the grievances of casual employees in the telecom department were considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in several cases holding that a casual employee who completed 240 days service continuously is entitled for regularization; that the workmen also worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more but denied work under the muster rolls with an ulterior motive to prevent them from getting their services regularized. Their grievances were raised individually and through the union to take them back on duty on muster roll and to confer them with 'temporary status' on par with the casual mazdoors have not been met by the management despite their efforts and therefore, the action of the management in not doing so is illegal, arbitrary and violative of rights guaranteed under the constitution; that they were entitled to be conferred, with the 'temporary status' in the light of the circular of the year 1989 at Ex. W1 followed by the Circular of the year 1990 at Ex. W2 and the Circular at Ex. W3 and the Circular at Ex. M1 of the year 1993 relied upon by the management is not applicable to their case; that the action of the management in terminating the services of the first party workmen refusing work to them is again against the provisions of Section 25F, G & H of the ID Act. They further contended that the work they were carrying out of digging for laying the telephone cable, of telephone repairs and their maintenance and installation still continues being permanent in nature and therefore, the management was not justified in terminating from services and not conferring them with temporary status and then not regularizing their services. Therefore, they requested this tribunal to direct the management to take back them in service by giving them work on muster roll, conferring 'temporary status' and regularizing their services.

4. The case of the management as made out in the Counter Statements in respect of all the three workmen in brief is that they have worked as a casual labourers from 1-4-1986 to 30-6-1987 with breaks in between i.e. 240 days in the year 1986 and 169 days in the year 1987. While denying the contentions of the first party workmen that their services have been refused under muster roll subsequent to July 1987 with an ulterior motive not to regularize them in services, the management contended that it has acted upon the DOT letter No. 269/4/93/STN-II dated 7-12-1993 (marked at Ex. M1) which says that casual mazdoors who were engaged in the Circles during the period from 31-3-1985 to 22-6-1988 and who were continuing as workers in the circles as on 17-12-1993 and who were not absent for more than 365 days as on 17-12-1993 were only

eligible for consideration and confirmation of temporary status and since the first party workmen have not fulfilled the above said conditions, their cases have not been considered; that this policy decision announced and adopted by the management to consider the cases of those who satisfied the above said conditions and those who had satisfied and fulfilled those conditions have been confirmed without any exception; that the department of Telecom ACJ serves the purpose of receipt for the payment made them & there for the auto fare paid to the auto driver and therefore, such payment cannot be compared with the payment made to the workers working under the muster roll, which shows the particulars with regard to the payment, the period of the work and the nature of the work carried out by the workers. Therefore, there has been no violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India or the violation of decision of their Lordship of Supreme Court in the circulars issued and the Scheme formulated the management for the purpose of regularizing the services of the casual labourers. The management contended that since the first party workmen were working as casual labourers to do a particular work and after completion of such particular work, they have been relieved from their duties and therefore, there cannot be any violation of the provisions of Section 25F, H & H of the ID Act as contended by the workmen.

5. The management in support of the defence taken by it examined one witness as MW1 common in all the three cases and got marked one document namely, the above said Circular at Ex. M1. In his examination chief as far as first party workman in CR No. 2/02, he stated that he worked as a casual worker between 10-8-1985 to 30-9-1986 and from 1-11-1986 to 31-12-1986 intermittently. With respect to workman in CR No. 3/02, he says that he worked as a casual worker between 1-9-1985 to 30-6-1987 for 233 days intermittently and with regard to the workman in CR No. 4/02 he stated that he also worked for a period of 233 days intermittently between 1-9-1985 to 30-6-1986. He then stated that casual worker will be paid on MR payment basis based on the working days at the end of the month and workmen were being paid likewise. They were being engaged as and when work was available by temporary basis and the Linemen have got the authority to employ them as casual workers for petty work and pay the wages and that the work which was being discharged by the workmen is not now in existence. Then he referred to the circular issued in the month of December 1993 at Ex. M1 to say that it was in respect to confer temporary status and to regularize the services of casual workers and that conditions have not been fulfilled by the first party workmen. He also stated there was a total ban to engage casual workers from 31-3-1985 onwards. In his last sentence he stated that their department has got powers to regularize the services of the casual workers as per the conditions shown in Ex. M1 and they have not terminated the services of the first party

workmen. In his cross examination it was elicited that the above said circular at Ex. M1 is an extension to the Scheme Casual labourers grant of temporary status and regularization, 1989 vide Ex. W1 and he admitted that as per the said scheme a casual worker working continuously for 240 days in a calendar year from the date of his joining on Muster Rolls will be entitled to his service regularization and temporary status. It was also elicited that circular dated 19-12-1990 at Ex. W2 is by way of clarification given about the said scheme and Circular at Ex. W3 is with regard to the procedure as to how break in service to be condoned. He admitted that the workers were being paid under the head ACJ for having carried out the work of digging, cable laying, erection of poles and giving new lines to the connections and their signatures will be taken for payment accounting towards the department and that ACJ payment bills are continued even after 1994. He denied the suggestion that they have stopped work of the first party workmen on account of the ban and that the first party workmen did not abandon their services on their own.

6. The first party workmen in all the 3 cases have filed their affidavit evidence and in their further examination chief have got marked documents at Ex. W4 to W6 apart from documents at Ex. W1 to W3 got marked during the course of cross examination of MW1 (These are all the documents common in all the three cases). In their examination chief they have just repeated the various averments made by them in their Claim Statement. In their cross examination (common in all), it was elicited that no appointment order was issued to them as a casual mander and that they have not worked continuously with the management between 1985 to 1987 and that their names do not find place on muster roll and that the work they were discharging is now not in existence. They denied the suggestion that documents Ex. W4 & 5 are created one and that they have not worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more and that their claims were false.

7. In CR No. 2/02 two witnesses, as WW2 & 3 have filed their affidavit evidence on behalf of the first party workmen speaking to the fact that the first party workman was working under the Lineman, Shri Kaverappa and assisting him for installation of the telephone instruments and giving connections and his installation has also given by said Kaverappa and that the first party workman was working under said Kaverappa. To prove that they held telephone connections, they produced telephone bills at Ex. W7 & 8. For workman in CR No. 3/02 Shri Venkateshappa and Venkateswamy were examined as WW2 & WW3 speaking to the fact that the workman in this case was working under lineman Shri Narasimhappa, who installed the telephone instruments of himself and his daughter and it is they who were attending to the repairs to the installation whenever needed. He also produced the telephone bills in his name and in the name of his daughter

at Ex. W9 series. The workman in CR No. 4/02 produced two witnesses by name Shri Narayanaswamy and Shri P. Ashok as WW2 & WW3 stating to the fact that he was attending to the installation work, maintenance etc. under the lineman Shri Kaverappa and they produced telephone bills at Ex. W8 & 9 respectively. In the common cross examination of all the above said telephone consumers, it was elicited that they have not received notice from the telephone department of sending the first party workmen for installation and they have no basis to show that they were only attending to their telephone instruments whenever there was any trouble.

8. Learned Counsel Smt. Shantha Chellappa who is representing the workmen in all these 3 cases submitted her written arguments. Whereas, learned counsel Shri MCR representing the management was not available when the matter was taken up for arguments finally. Arguments of learned counsel for the first party workmen are that despite the refusal of work to the workmen under muster roll from July, 1987 onwards, the first party workmen have been carrying out the telecom work like digging etc. under the permanent lineman, Shri Kaverappa, Narasimhappa and Shanker Roddy and they are being paid under the head ACJ Account and are being issued bills accordingly and the first party in this way have been working all along and therefore, they were entitled to be conferred with "temporary status" and regularization of their services as per the circulars/ letters at Ex. W1 to W3 and the circular at Ex. M1 issued in the year 1993 relied upon by the management is not applicable to the case of the workmen. She took support of the oral testimony of the workmen corroborated by the statements of Telecom consumers examined on their behalf speaking to the fact that the workmen were working under the aforesaid permanent linemen carrying out the work of installations, new connections, digging, cable laying and attending request to the installation etc.

9. In order to appreciate the arguments advanced for the first party workmen, in the first instance, I would like to come to the aforesaid 3 circulars/letters at Ex. W1 to W3. As per the circular letter at Ex. W1, which comes into effect on 1-10-1989, casual labourers who were found engaged as on 1-10-1989 and had rendered a continuous service of atleast one year should have been given temporary status to be absorbed in Group 'D' subsequently after regularization. The condition precedent was that those casual labourers should have been engaged after 30-3-1985 and were continued to be engaged up till 22-6-1988. The circular at Ex. W2 came to be issued in the year 1990 to the effect that the casual labourers who were engaged prior to 30-3-1985 and was not qualified for temporary status in accordance with Para 5.1 of the Casual Labourers (grant of temporary status and regularization) Scheme (Ex. W1) dated 1-10-1989 will also become eligible

for such a status subsequently on completion of period of duty of 240 days (206 days in the case of offices observing 5 days a week) during the preceding 12 calendar months and their status shall be given retrospective effect not earlier than 1-10-1989. A circular/letter dated 24-2-1992 at Ex. W3 came to be issued to the effect that any Mazdoor having a continuous break of more than 12 months (after 30-3-1985) his break in service should have been duly condoned as per rules i.e. six months can be condoned for Mazdoor and 12 months for non availability of work. Now, comes the circular/letter at Ex. M1 dated 1-12-1993 reading to the effect that all those casual Mazdoors who were engaged by the Circles during the period from 31-3-1985 to 22-6-1988 and who were still continuing for such works in the circles were they were initially engaged and who were not absent for the last more than 365 days counting from the date of issue of this order can be brought under the scheme dated 1-10-1989 (Ex. W2). Now, therefore, in the light of the first 3 circulars/letters at Ex. W1 to W3, learned counsel wanted to say that the case of the workmen come under the ambit of those circular/letters as they were undisputedly in the services of the management on muster roll between 31-3-1985 and 22-6-1988 and they were very much in the service of the management as on 1-10-1989 working under the permanent linemen being paid against ACJ account which payment in fact was being reimbursed to the lineman by the management. Her further contention is that even otherwise, Ex. M1, circular of the year 1993 as admitted by the management witness was in extension of the scheme dated 1-10-1989 and since as on 1993 also the first party workmen were rendering their services through permanent linemen they should have been brought under the said scheme being conferred with temporary status and then their services through permanent linemen they should have been brought under the said scheme being conferred with temporary status and then their services could have been regularized as per the said scheme.

10. The fact that the first party workmen were rendering the services of casual Mazdoor between 31-3-1985 and 22-6-1988 is not disputed and cannot be disputed as in the very admissions made by the management in the Counter statement as well as in the evidence of MW1 the first party workmen were in the service of the management between September/October, 1985 and July, 1987.

11. Now, the only question to be considered would be whether the first party workmen were in the service of the management as on 1-10-1989 *vide* Ex. W1 or on 1-12-1993 *vide* Ex. M1 so as to claim the benefit of the said scheme. Of course in the oral evidence or the aforesaid telecom consumers couples with the oral testimony of the first party workmen and the telephone bills produced, it has been tried to be established that these workmen were working under the permanent linemen namely, Kaverappa,

Narasimhappa and Shanker Reddy. MW1 in his cross examination was to admit that said Kaverappa was the lineman at the relevant point of time but he was not sure about the said Narasimhappa. It is the case of the first party workmen themselves that they were being paid wages by these permanent linemen under the bills being issued against ACJ account. Now, therefore, question arises as to whether services rendered by the first party workmen under the said permanent lineman could be construed to be the services rendered by them under the management itself. I am afraid such a construction would be hazardous. It is not in dispute that the payment against the ACJ account through bills was meant towards auto services to the auto driver and it was rightly contended for the management that services rendered against ACJ account cannot be compared with the services rendered by the workers being on muster roll. That apart, the first party workmen in their Claim Statement as well as in their evidence except to say that after they were refused work by the management subsequent to July, 1987 they had been working under permanent linemen and it is subsequent to 1994 payment through ACJ also stopped and that from 1997 onwards they have been working under said Shri Kaverappa and Narasimhappa. Therefore, for the period in between 1987 and 1999, there is absolutely no case made out by the first party workmen as to under whom rather under which permanent lineman they were at least working against ACJ Account being paid through bills. Even, assuming for a moment that payment against ACJ account was stopped by the management subsequent to 1994 then again there is a very much vacuum created for the period in between July, 1987 and the year 1994. Therefore, we have absolutely no evidence before this tribunal on behalf of the first party workmen to suggest that as on 1-10-1989 when the above said scheme conferring temporary status and regularization of services came into effect, they were under the services of the management directly. There is again no material on record to suggest that as on 1-12-1993 they were in the services of the management as casual mazdoors so as to drive the benefit arising out of the above said two circulars. The first party workmen will be entitled to the benefits under the aforesaid two circulars only in case they were working as Casual mazdoors having continuous service of 240 days and more in any calendar year and not on the ground that services rendered by them under the permanent lineman subsequent to July, 1987 be taken to be the services rendered by them under the management. It might be that as argued for the first party workmen, the management adopted tactics of taking work from the workmen through permanent linemen not under the muster roll in order to see that they do not get benefits of regularization of their services but taking shelter under that the first party cannot be taken to be the employees of the management so as to get benefit under the above said two circulars. In fact, as has come on record, there were instructions issued to stop the fresh recruitments and

employment of casual labourers for any type of work in telecom circles from 30-3-1985 onwards. It might be that under the grab of the said instruction not only the management stopped engaging fresh casual labourers after 30-3-1985 but also discontinued the services of the first party workmen as they were engaged as casual labourers subsequent to 30-3-1985. Assuming for a moment that there has been contravention of the aforesaid instructions and circulars/letters issued by the department at Ex. W1 to W3 in not extending the benefits of the scheme at Ex. W1 to the first party workmen, the only proper course for the first party workmen available was to have challenged the action of the management at appropriate time. They did not challenge the action of the management in refusing services to them under muster roll subsequent to July, 1987. They did not challenge the action of the management in not extending them benefits of the scheme at Ex. W1 and they also did not challenge the circular at Ex. M1 agitating their rights to get the benefits available under the aforesaid circulars at Ex. W1 and Ex. M1 at any point of time. According to them they keep working under the permanent linemen for about a period of more than 10 years without staking their claim under the above state scheme or challenging the action of the management refusing their services on muster roll. Therefore, it is too late in the day for the workmen now to assert their rights seeking benefits under the above said scheme of the year 1989. Therefore, in the light of the above, this tribunal has no hesitation in its mind to come to the conclusion that services if any, rendered by the first party workmen as casual workers under the so called permanent linemen cannot be equated with the services rendered by them under the management so as to be bestowed with the benefits arising out of the aforesaid circulars at Ex. W1 & M1. The circulars/letters at Ex. W2 & 3 would not come in the way of the first party workmen in getting the benefits under Circulars at Ex. W1 & M1 had they established before this tribunal that they were in the direct employment of the management as on 1-10-1989 or as on 1-12-1993. Since in their own words that they have carried out the work of digging, installations of telephone instruments and attending repairs etc. against the ACJ account working under the permanent linemen and were being paid through bills against the said ACJ account which payment cannot be equated to the payment of wages to them working under muster roll as casual mazdoor they cannot stake their claim seeking benefits arising out of Circulars at Ex. W1 and M1. Further more, for such reliefs cannot be maintained in these proceedings, they being beyond the scope of reference schedules confined to alleged illegal termination.

12. Now coming to the question of their alleged termination of services from muster roll from July, 1987 onwards, undisputedly the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25 F of the ID Act while refusing them work under muster roll. As could be seen

from the records and in the very admissions of the management, the first party workmen were under the employment of the management from 1-8-1985 to 30-9-1986 and from 1-11-1986 to 31-12-1986 in the case of workman in CR No. 2/02 and in the case of workmen in CR No. 3/02 & CR 4/02 they were in the service of the management from 10-9-1985 to 30-6-1987 for 233 days intermittently. The management has not produced any material before this Tribunal to suggest that the first party did not work continuously for 240 days immediately preceding the refusal of work to the workmen. When undisputedly, the first party workmen were in the service of the management for a period of more than 12 months earlier to July 1987 or earlier to 31-12-1986 as the case may be, it was the bounden duty of the management to produce some evidence before this Tribunal to justify their case that first party workmen have not worked continuously for 240 days or more in a particular calendar year particularly, when MW1 in his cross examination admitted that the copies of the muster rolls showing the number of days worked will be with the workmen and the original muster rolls are available in the office of the management. The muster rolls copies produced by the first party workmen make it abundantly clear that they have worked for 240 days and more continuously before their services were refused by the management under the muster roll. Therefore, it is a clear cut case of retrenchment defined under Section 2 (oo) of the ID Act. Therefore, the first party workmen must be held to be entitled to the benefits arising out of Section 25F (a&b) of the ID Act, their termination being in violation of the abovesaid section. However, they cannot be given the relief of reinstatement first of all on the ground that they have not asked for the said relief and secondly for the reason that they have not claimed such a relief either immediately or during any reasonable period subsequent to the refusal of work to them from July 1987 onwards. Therefore, it must be presumed that the dispute with regard to the termination was not all existing as on the date they have raised the present dispute in the year 2002. It must also be presumed that they have given up their right of reinstatement when they started working under the so called permanent linemen without challenging the action of the management in terminating their services. Accordingly, the references are answered and following award is passed.

AWARD

The management is directed to pay retrenchment compensation to the first party workmen as provided under Section 25F (a&b) of the ID Act. The references of the first party for any relief apart from the compensation under Section 25F (a&b) are rejected. Copy of the award be kept in CR No. 3/02 & CR No. 4/02 respectively. No costs.

A.R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4445.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/294/1999-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4445.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/294/1999-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 10th October 2006

PRESENT

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C. R. No. 1/2000

I PARTY

Shri A. V. Ramesh,
S/o Venkataramappa
Avani,
Mulabagal Taluk,
KOLAR-563 101

II PARTY

The District Telecom Manager,
Telecom Department,
Kolar District,
KOLAR-563 101

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred these disputes vide order No. L-40012/294/1999-IR (DU) dated 16th December, 1999 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether Shri A. V. Ramesh, former Casual Labourer of Telecom Department, Kolar, is eligible for conferment of temporary status? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The grounds urged in the Claim Statement, by way of documentary and oral evidence and the defence taken by the first party in the cross-examination of the management witness is that he had been working with the management joining the services of the Telecom Department at Kolar in the year 1985 as a Casual Labour and worked there on Muster Roll till July 1987 and it is from the month of July 1987 onwards he has been refused work under the muster roll. Thereupon, he was forced to work under permanent employee and was being paid through bills under ACJ account at the rate of Rs. 280 per month; that the payment through ACJ was also stopped from the year 1994 onwards to avoid documentary evidence showing the payment and it is since 1997, he has been working under the Lineman, Chellapathy executing the work of telecom department being paid Rs. 600 monthly by the said Lineman, Shri Chellapathy through the bills in turn being reimbursed by the department to the Lineman. The workman then contended that he has been agitating for giving work under muster roll and for regularizing their services and give them the benefits of permanent employee since long, as the grievances of casual employees in the telecom department were considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in several cases holding that a casual employee who completed 240 days service continuously is entitled for regularization; that the workman also worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more but denied work under the muster roll with an ulterior motive to prevent him from getting his services regularized. His grievance was raised individually and through the union to take him back on duty on muster roll and to confer him with 'temporary status' on par with the casual mazdoors have not been met by the management despite their efforts and therefore, the action of the management in not doing so is illegal, arbitrary and violative of rights guaranteed under the constitution; that he was entitled to be conferred with the 'temporary status' in the light of the circular of the year 1989 at Ex. W1 followed by the Circular of the year 1990 at Ex. W2 and the Circular at Ex. W3 and the Circular at Ex. M1 of the year 1993 relied upon by the management is not applicable to his case. Therefore, he requested this tribunal to direct the management to take back him in service by giving him work on muster roll, conferring 'temporary status' and regularizing their services.

3. The case of the management as made out in the Counter Statement, in brief, is that he had worked as a casual labourer from 1-4-1986 to 30-6-1987 with breaks in between i.e. 240 days in the year 1986 and 169 days in the year 1987. While denying the contentions of the first party workman that his services have been refused under muster roll subsequent to July 1987 with an ulterior motive not to regularize him in services, the management contended that it has acted upon the DOT letter No. 269/4/93/STN-II dated 7-12-1993 (marked at Ex. M1) which says that casual mazdoors who were engaged in the Circles during the period

from 31-3-1985 to 22-6-1988 and who were continuing as workers in the circles as on 17-12-1993 and who were not absent for more than 365 days as on 17-12-1993 were only eligible for consideration and confirmation of 'temporary status' and since the first party workman has not fulfilled the above said conditions, his case has not been considered; that this policy decision announced and adopted by the management to consider the cases of those who satisfied the above said conditions and those who had satisfied and fulfilled those conditions have been confirmed without any exception; that the department of Telecom ACJ serves the purpose of receipt for the payment made then and there for the auto fare paid to the auto driver and therefore, such payment cannot be compared with the payment made to the workers working under the muster roll, which shows the particulars with regard to the payment, the period of the work and the nature of the work carried out by the workers. Therefore, there has been no violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India or the violation of decision of their Lordship of Supreme Court in the circulars issued and the Scheme formulated by the management for the purpose of regularizing the services of the casual labourers.

4. The management in support of the defence taken by it examined one witness as MW1 and got marked one document namely, the above said Circular at Ex. M1. In his examination chief, he stated that he worked as a casual worker between 1-4-1986 to 30-6-1987. He then stated that casual worker will be paid on MR payment basis based on the working days at the end of the month and workman was being paid likewise. He was being engaged as and when work was available by temporary basis and the Lineman have got the authority to employ him as casual worker for petty work and pay the wages and that the work which was being discharged by the workman is not now in existence. Then he referred to the circular issued in the month of December 1993 at Ex. M1 to say that it was in respect to confer temporary status and to regularize the services of casual workers and that conditions have not been fulfilled by the first party workman. He also stated there was a total ban to engage casual workers from 31-3-1985 onwards. In his last sentence he stated that their department has got powers to regularize the services of the casual workers as per the conditions shown in Ex. M1 and they have not terminated the services of the first party workman. In his cross-examination it was elicited that the above said circular at Ex. M1 is an extension to the Scheme, called 'Casual Labourers Grant of Temporary Status and Regularization, 1989' vide Ex. W4 and he admitted that as per the said scheme a casual worker working continuously for 240 days in a calendar year from the date of his joining on Muster Rolls will be entitled to his service regularization and temporary status. It was also elicited that circular dated 19-12-1990 at Ex. W2 is by way of clarification given about the said scheme and Circular at Ex. W3 is with regard to the

procedure as to how break in service to be condoned. He admitted that the workers were being paid under the head ACJ for having carried out the work of digging, cable laying, erection of poles and giving new lines to the connections and their signatures will be taken for payment accounting towards the department and the ACJ payment bills are continued even after 1994. He denied the suggestion that they have stopped work of the first party workman on account of the ban and that the first party workman did not abandon his services on his own.

5. The first party workman has filed his affidavit evidence and in his further exam-in-chief has got marked documents at Ex. W4 to W6 apart from documents at Ex. W1 to W3 got marked during the course of cross-examination of MW1. In his examination chief he has just repeated the various averments made by him in his Claim Statement. In his cross-examination, it was elicited that no appointment order was issued to him as a casual mazdoor, he denied the suggestions that he has not worked continuously with the management between 1985 to 1987 and that his name does not find place on muster roll and that the work he was discharging is now not in existence. He denied the suggestion that documents Ex. W4 & W5 are created one and that he has not worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more and that his claim was false.

6. On his behalf two witnesses by name K. Rajanna and Shri Ramappa have been examined as WW2 & WW3 and in their further examination chief got marked documents at Ex. W5 to W8. In their affidavit they have spoken to the fact that the first party was working under the said permanent Lineman. Shri Chellapathy assisting him for installation of telephone instruments giving connections, attending repairs, installation etc. In their cross-examination it was elicited that they have not received the notice from the telephone department of sending the first party workman for installation and he has no basis to show that he was only attending their telephone instruments whenever there was any trouble.

7. Learned Counsel Shri S. A. representing the workman submitted his written arguments so also learned counsel for the management. Arguments of learned counsel for the first party workman are that despite the refusal of work to the workman under muster roll from July 1987 onwards, the first party workman has been carrying out the telecom work like digging etc. under the permanent lineman, Shri Chellapathy, and he is being paid under the head ACJ Account and is being issued bills accordingly and the first party in this way has been working all along and therefore, he was entitled to be conferred with 'temporary status' and regularization of his services as per the circulars/letters at Ex. W1 to W3 and the circular at Ex. M1 issued in the year 1993 relied upon by the management is not applicable to the case of the workman. He took support of the oral testimony of the workman

corroborated by the statements of Telecom consumers examined on his behalf speaking to the fact that the workman was working under the aforesaid permanent line man carrying out the work of installations, new connections, digging, cable laying and attending request to the installation etc.

8. In order to appreciate the arguments advanced for the first party workman, in the first instance, I would like to come to the aforesaid 3 circulars/letters at Ex. W1 to W3. As per the circular letter at Ex. W1, which comes into effect on 1-10-1989, casual labourers who were found engaged as on 1-10-1989 and had rendered a continuous service of atleast one year should have been given temporary status to be absorbed in Group 'D' subsequently after regularization. The condition precedent was that those casual labourers should have been engaged after 30-3-1985 and were continued to be engaged up till 22-6-1988. The circular at Ex. W2 came to be issued in the year 1990 to the effect that the casual labourers who were engaged prior to 30-3-1985 and was not qualified for temporary status in accordance with Para 5.1 of the Casual Labourers (grant of temporary status and regularization) Scheme (Ex. W1) dated 1-10-1989 will also become eligible for such a status subsequently on completion of period of duty of 240 days (206 days in the case of offices observing 5 days a week) during the preceding 12 calendar months and their status shall be given retrospective effect not earlier than 1-10-1989. A circular/letter dated 24-2-1992 at Ex. W3 came to be issued to the effect that any mazdoor having a continuous break of more than 12 months (after 30-3-1985) his break in service should have been duly condoned as per rules i.e. six months can be condoned for Mazdoor and 12 months for non availability of work. Now, comes the circular/letter at Ex. M1 dated 1-12-1993 reading to the effect that all those casual mazdoors who were engaged by the Circles during the period from 31-3-1985 to 22-6-1988 and who were still continuing for such works in the circles where they were initially engaged and who were not absent for the last more than 365 days counting from the date of issue of this order can be brought under the scheme dated 1-10-1989 (Ex. W2). Now, therefore, in the light of the first 3 circulars/letters at Ex. W1 to W3, learned counsel wanted to say that the case of the workman comes under the ambit of those circular/letters as he was undisputedly in the services of the management on muster roll between 31-3-1985 and 22-6-1988 and he was very much in the service of the management as on 1-10-1989 working under the permanent lineman being paid against ACJ account which payment in fact was being reimbursed to the lineman by the management. His further contention is that even otherwise, Ex. M1, circular of the year 1993 as admitted by the management witness was the extension of the scheme dated 1-10-1989 and since as on 1993 also the first party workman was rendering his services through permanent lineman he should have been brought under the said scheme

being conferred with temporary status and then his services could have been regularized as per the said scheme.

9. The fact that the first party workman was rendering the services of casual mazdoor between 31-3-1985 and 22-6-1988 is not disputed and cannot be disputed as in the very admissions made by the management in the Counter Statement as well as in the evidence of MW1 the first party workman was in the service of the management between September/October 1985 and July 1987.

10. Now, the only question to be considered would be whether the first party workman was in the service of the management as on 1-10-1989 vide Ex. W1 or on 1-12-1993 vide Ex. M1 so as to claim the benefit of the said scheme. Of course, in the oral evidence of the aforesaid telecom consumers coupled with the oral testimony of the first party workman and the telephone bills produced, it has been tried to be established that the workman was working under the permanent lineman namely, Chellapathy. It is the case of the first party workman himself that he was being paid wages by the permanent lineman under the bills being issued against ACJ account. Now, therefore, question arises as to whether services rendered by the first party workman under the said permanent lineman could be construed to be the services rendered by him under the management itself. I am afraid such a construction would be hazardous. It is not in dispute that the payment against the ACJ account through bills was meant towards auto services to the auto driver and it was rightly contended for the management that services rendered against ACJ account cannot be compared with the services rendered by the workers being on muster roll. That apart, the first party workman in his Claim Statement as well as in his evidence except to say that after he was refused work by the management subsequent to July 1987 he had been working under permanent lineman and it is subsequent to 1994 payment through ACJ also stopped and that from 1997 onwards he has been working under said Shri Chellapathy. Therefore, for the period in between 1987 and 1994, there is absolutely no case made out by the first party workman as to under whom rather under which permanent lineman he was atleast working against ACJ Account being paid through bills. Even, assuming for a moment that payment against ACJ account was stopped by the management subsequent to 1994 then again there is a very much vacuum created for the period in between July 1987 and the year 1994. Therefore, we have absolutely no evidence before this tribunal on behalf of the first party workman to suggest that as on 1-10-1989 when the above said scheme conferring temporary status and regularization of services came into effect, they were under the services of the management, directly. There is again no material on record to suggest that as on 1-12-1993 he was in the services of the management as casual mazdoor so as to derive the benefits arising out of the above said two circulars. The first party workman will be entitled to the benefits under

the aforesaid two circulars only in case he was working as casual mazdoor having continuous service of 240 days and more in any calendar year and not on the ground that services rendered by him under the permanent lineman subsequent to July 1987 be taken to be the services rendered by him under the management. It might be that as argued for the first party workman, the management adopted tactics of taking work from the workman through permanent lineman not under the muster roll in order to see that he does not get benefits of regularization of his services but taking shelter under that the first party cannot be taken to be the employee of the management so as to get benefits under the above said two circulars. In fact, as has come on record, there were instructions issued to the stop fresh recruitments and employment of casual labourers for any type of work in telecom circles from 30-3-1985 onwards. It might be that under the grab of the said instructions not only the management stopped engaging fresh casual labourers after 30-3-1985 but also discontinued the services of the first party workman as he was engaged as casual labour subsequent to 30-3-1985. Assuming for a moment that there has been contravention of the aforesaid instructions and circulars/letters issued by the department at Ex. W1 to W3 in not extending the benefits of the scheme at Ex. W1 to the first party workman, the only proper course for the first party workman available was to have challenged the action of the management at appropriate time. He did not challenge the action of the management in refusing services to him under muster roll subsequent to July 1987. He did not challenge the action of the management in not extending him benefits of the scheme at Ex. W1 and he also did not challenge the circular at Ex. M1 agitating his rights to get the benefits available under the aforesaid circulars at Ex. W1 and Ex. M1 at any point of time. According to him he keeps working under the permanent lineman for about a period of more than 10 years without staking his claim under the above said scheme or challenging the action of the management refusing his services on muster roll. Therefore, it is too late in the day for the workman now to assert his rights seeking benefits under the above said scheme of the year 1989. Therefore, in the light of the above, this tribunal has no hesitation in its mind to come to the conclusion that services if any, rendered by the first party workman as casual worker under the so called permanent lineman cannot be equated with the services rendered by him under the management so as to be bestowed with the benefits arising out of the aforesaid circulars at Ex. W1 & M1. The circulars/letters at Exs. W2 & 3 would no come in the way of the first party workman in getting the benefits under Circulars at Exs. W1 & M1 had he established before this tribunal that he was in the direct employment of the management as on 1-10-1989 or as on 1-12-1993. Since in his own words that he carried out the work of digging, installations of telephone instruments and attending repairs etc. against the ACJ account working under the permanent lineman and was being paid through ACJ bills against the said ACJ accounts which payment cannot be equated to the payment of wages to him working under muster roll as

casual mazdoors, he cannot stake his claim seeking benefits arising out of Circulars at Exs. W1 and M1.

11. Therefore, there cannot be any hesitation to come to the conclusion that the first party is not eligible for confirmation of temporary status and accordingly, the reference is answered and following award is passed.

AWARD

The Reference stands dismissed. No costs.

(Dictated to PA, transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 10th October, 2006).

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4446.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध विभागों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्राम न्यायालय नं.-1, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 79/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/403/1999-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th October, 2006

S.O. 4446.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 79/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No. 1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 25-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/403/1999-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 79/2000

Sh. Raghuvir Singh
S/o Sh. Gurnel Singh
C/o Sh. N. K. Jeet, President,
Telecom Labour Union,
Mohalla Hari Nagar,
Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda (Pb)-151 001.

... Applicant

versus

The General Manager, Telecom,
Bhatinda (Punjab)-151 001

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the Workman : Sh. Vijay Kumar
 For the Management : Sh. G. C. Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 28-9-2006

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/403/99-IR (D.U.) dated 17-02-2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in terminating the services of Sh. Raghuvir Singh S/o Sh. Gurmel Singh is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date ?”

2. The case taken up in Lok Adalat at the request of the parties. The authorised representative of workman Shri Vijay Kumar withdraw the present reference vide his statement recorded on 21-09-2006. In view of the same, the present reference is returned as withdrawn in Lok Adalat. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer
 28-09-2006

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4447.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डी. बी. सी. सन्स प्रा. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-I के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी. 1/1995) को प्रकटित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-31011/5/1994-आई आर (विविध)]
 बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4447.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT 1/1995) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. I, now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. DBC's Sons Pvt. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-31011/5/1994-IR (M)]
 B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
 INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI**

PRESENT

Justice Ghanshyam Dass, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-01 OF 1995

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s.
 Darabshaw B. Cursetjee's Sons (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES

For the Management : Mr. D. J. Kapadia, Adv.
 For the Union : Mr. Sunil Patil, Adv.
 State : Maharashtra

Mumbai, dated the 11th day of October, 2006

AWARD

1. This is a reference made by the Central Government in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub-section 1 of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (the Act for short) vide Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi Order No. L-31011/5/94-I.R. (Misc) dated 12-1-1995. The terms of reference given in the schedule are as follows :

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Darabshaw B. Cursetjee's Sons (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd. in terminating the services of Shri Madhukar R. Mahakal and 37 other workmen and Shri Shantaram Bhagoji Jadhav and 23 other workmen (as per list attached) with effect from 6-6-1990 is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to ?”

2. With a view to comply with the direction of the Honourable High Court of Bombay in W.P. No. 2046 of 1999 the Order dt. 20-6-2006 was passed by this Tribunal after hearing the parties on the subject matter in issue whereby all the controversial points had been resolved and the parties had been directed to submit calculations accordingly for the payment of due money to the workmen. The aforesaid order has become final since parties have not challenged it. The learned counsel for the Management has filed a detailed chart in respect of 49 workmen named therein to show the actual amount due to the Management and payable to the workmen. This calculation is not being challenged by the learned counsel Mr. Patil for the workmen. This calculation is in respect of 49 workmen only. It does not relate to other workmen who have expired during the pendency of the litigation and their legal heirs have not been brought on record in accordance with law. Hence, the legal heirs cannot be given any payment at this juncture.

3. Hence, the aforesaid chart is accepted as final dues payable to the workmen. The Management is accordingly directed to pay to each of the workmen the amount due as mentioned in the chart which forms part of this Award through a Account Payee Cheque in the name of the workmen concerned in presence of Mr. Patil, Adv. or any other authorized representative of the Union to confirm the identification of the workmen. The compliance of this order may be made within thirty days positively failing which the Management would be paddled with the liability of penal interest.

4. The Award is made accordingly.

Justice GHANSHYAM DASS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4448.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आई. ओ. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अजमेर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 3/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/8/2006-आई आर (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4448.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 3/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ajmer, now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of IOCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-30012/8/2006-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

अनुबन्ध

अम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण, अजमेर

सी.आई.टी.आर. नं. 3/06

रेफ़रेंस संख्या एल-30012/8/2006-आई. आर. (एम)

दि. 24-8-06

प्रसंग :

ओम प्रकाश खानचन्दानी पुत्र स्व. श्री करमचंद खानचन्दानी, निवासी 2-जी-4, अजय नगर, अजमेर, जिला अजमेर

... प्रार्थी

बनाम

1. प्लांट मैनेजर, आई. ओ. सी. लि., इण्डियन बॉटलिंग प्लांट, ग्राम तबीजी के पास, हाइवे नम्बर 8, अजमेर

2. दि. डिप्टी जनरल मैनेजर (एच. आर.) इण्डियन ऑयल कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड, इण्डियन ऑयल भवन, सुसुफ सराय, नई दिल्ली

अप्रार्थीगण

दि. 21-9-06

अवार्ड

केन्द्र सरकार नई दिल्ली से प्राप्त रेफ़रेंस इस प्रकार है :—

"Whether the action of the management of Dy. General Manager (H. R.), I. O. C. L., New Delhi in terminating the services of Sh. Omparkash Khanchandani S/o Sh. Karam Chand vide their letter dated 22-7-05 is just and legal? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. प्रार्थी को क्लेम पेश करने के लिए नोटिस जारी किये गये। प्रार्थी की ओर से आज ही एक प्रार्थना पत्र पेश कर कथन किया है कि "यदि प्रार्थी केस को विद्वद्धार कर होता है तो यूनियन उक्त प्रकरण को अप्रार्थी के समक्ष रखकर टेक-ऑफ करने को तैयार है।" अतः प्रार्थी ने इस प्रकरण को अपने अधिकारों को सुरक्षित रखते हुए विद्वद्धार करने बाबत अनुमति देने की प्रार्थना की है।

मैंने प्रार्थी को सुना और पत्रावली का ध्यानपूर्वक अवलोकन किया।

प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रस्तुत प्रार्थना पत्र के आधार पर प्रार्थी को प्रकरण विद्वद्धार करने की अनुमति एतद्वारा प्रदान की जाती है।

अवार्ड की प्रति नियमानुसार केन्द्र सरकार को प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवा दी जावे।

अवार्ड आज दि. 21-9-06 को खुले न्यायालय में लिखवाया जाकर सुनाया गया।

जी. एस. शेखावत, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4449.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत गोल्ड माईन्स लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 11/90 एण्ड 25/92) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-43012/18/89-आई आर (विविध)]

एण्ड एल-43012/19/89-आई आर (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4449.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 11/90 and 25/92) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/

Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-43012/18/89-IR(M) and L-43012/19/89-IR(M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 9th October, 2006

PRESENT:

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer.

C. R. No. 11/1990

Shri Segar,
Bharatipuram,
Pallukudsi,
Paduama Compound,
Anderson Post,
Kolar Gold Fields-563113

... I Party

The Managing Director,
Bharat Gold Mines Ltd.,
Oorgaum P.O.,
K. G. F.-563120

... II Party

C. R. No. 25/1992

Shri Ramachandran,
Rep. by the President Bharat Gold
Miner's Association,
No. 545, Near Punjabi Line,
Oorgaum,
K. G. F.

... I Party

The Managing Director,
Bharat Gold Mines Ltd.,
Oorgaum P. O.,
K. G. F.-563120

... II Party

COMMON AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred these disputes vide order No. L-43012/18/89-IR(Misc) and No. L-43012/19/89-IR(Misc) dated 16th February, 1990 and 13th February, 1992 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE (CR No. 11/90)

"Whether the action of the management of Bharat Gold Mines Limited, Oorgaum, K. G. F. in dismissing Shri Segar, PE No. 131827, Timberman, Champion Reef

Mine, on the charge of his involvement in theft of employer's property on 10-8-1988 is justifiable ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

SCHEDULE (CR No. 25/90)

"Whether the action of the management of BGML, KGF in dismissing Shri Ramachandran, PE No. 147434 Timberman CR Mine on charge of theft of employer's property on 10-8-1988 is justifiable ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?"

2. Both these cases are taken up together for disposal involving common question of law and facts and the disputes arising out of one and same incident with regard to the alleged theft committed by the first party workmen.

3. Separate chargesheets were issued to the first party workmen on the allegations of theft taken place on 10-8-1988 of the property belonging to the management. They submitted their reply to the chargesheets and the management not being satisfied with their explanation ordered domestic enquiry into the matter and thereupon, a regular joint Domestic Enquiry said to have conducted against both the workmen and on the basis of the enquiry findings holding them guilty of the charges, they have been dismissed from services.

4. Separate Claim Statements have been filed by each of the first party workmen wherein, they have challenged the enquiry proceedings conducted against them as violative of principles of natural justice, findings of the enquiry officer as perverse and the order of dismissal passed against them as unjust and illegal.

5. The management also filed separate counter statements of both the cases.

6. Keeping in view the respective contentions of the parties with regard to the legality and validity or otherwise of the proceedings, preliminary issues to the above effect were framed and my Learned Predecessor in CR No. 11/90 passed order dated 29-7-1997 on the above said preliminary issue holding that the enquiry held against the first party by the second party is not fair and proper, it being against the principles of natural justice. He also set aside the findings of the enquiry officer given in the aforesaid enquiry held against the workman, Shri Segar involved in CR No. 11/90. From the order sheet dated 2-6-1999 maintained in CR No. 25/92, it is read that my Learned Predecessor who passed the above said order on validity of the enquiry proceedings in CR No. 11/90, observed that in the face of the aforesaid order passed by him there was no necessity to pass any order on the very same issue in this case as in both the references joint enquiry conducted against both the workmen involving common incident of theft. However, proceedings in CR No. 25/92 were ordered to be taken up along with the proceedings in Misc. 15/99 where under, the management sought for recalling of the award passed in

CR 11/90 (Award passed on 21-1-1999). My learned predecessor vide award dated 21-1-1999 allowed the reference in CR No. 11/90 with a direction to the management to reinstate the first party workman or in the alternative he shall be entitled for 50 per cent of the back wages from the date of his dismissal till the date of his reinstatement. Likewise my Learned Predecessor also passed an award in CR No. 25/1992 allowing the reference with similar directions to the management.

7. It can be seen from the records that aggrieved by the award passed in CR No. 11/1990 the management preferred the two writ petitions. W. P. No. 34712/99 challenging the award dated 21-1-1999 and the orders dated 9-6-1999 dated 29-7-1997 and the writ petition No. 34716/99 challenging the award dated 11-6-1999. His Lordship of Hon'ble High Court allowed the writ petition No. 34712/99 setting aside the order dated 9-6-1999 where under my Learned Predecessor has dismissed the above said miscellaneous application No. 15/99. However, Writ Petition No. 34716/99 was rejected on the ground that the management has got other remedy by way of Miscellaneous Application to challenge the impugned order. Therefore, in the light of the order passed by his Lordship of Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No. 34712/99, matter was taken up before this tribunal for disposal of Miscellaneous Application No. 15/99 on merits. In the meanwhile, the management also filed another Misc. Application No. 32/05 to recall the award passed by this tribunal in CR No. 25/92. Both the Miscellaneous cases were taken up together by this tribunal and after hearing the learned counsels for the respective parties, both the petitions were allowed and the proceedings in both the references were taken up on record giving opportunity to the management to lead evidence afresh on merits to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party. Despite reasonable and sufficient opportunity given to the first party to lead fresh evidence on merits of the case, the management failed to adduce any evidence to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party workmen. When the matter was taken up for arguments on merits on 13-9-2006, learned counsel for the management filed separate memo in both the cases stating that the management after hectic search is unable to trace the management witnesses who had given evidence in the enquiry as one witness has taken VRs and some of them have resigned and some of them have left the company long back due to the closure of the company. Therefore, counsel for the management made a request to this tribunal to look into the evidence already brought on record during the course of enquiry and to pass necessary orders.

8. Whereas, learned counsel for the first party workmen submitted that when the enquiry has been set aside being found defective, the only way out to the management to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party workmen was by way of fresh

evidence as any evidence let in during the course of enquiry cannot be taken help of to prove the charges of misconduct when enquiry proceedings itself have set aside having been found defective by this tribunal. I find substance in his arguments.

9. In the instant case as noted above, the earlier awards infact were passed against the management allowing the references in favour of the workmen as the management failed to adduce fresh evidence to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party workman after DE held against them was set aside. Both the awards have been recalled by allowing above said two Miscellaneous Applications filed by the management with a condition that they shall complete the proceedings adducing their evidence within a period of six months from the date of the orders passed on Misc Petitions. Orders of Miscellaneous Petitions were passed on 31-5-2006. The management took adjournments for a period of about 4 months and still failed to adduce fresh evidence in the matter to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party workmen. Therefore, since the enquiry proceedings held against the first party workmen have been set aside, the only conclusion to be drawn would be that no departmental enquiries were conducted against the first party workmen much less to hold them guilty of the charges alleged against them. The request for management to read and take into consideration the evidence already let in the enquiry, cannot be granted, as evidence before the enquiry officer cannot be considered to prove the charges when enquiry proceedings have been set aside and enquiry findings are quashed already. In the result, the dismissal order passed against the workmen under the grab of any enquiry findings holding the workmen guilty of the charges again must be held to be nullity in the eye of law and accordingly those dismissal orders are liable to be set aside as illegal and void ab initio. Hence the following award :

AWARD

The management is directed to reinstate both the first party workmen in service with 50 per cent of the back wages from the date of their dismissal till the date of their reinstatement. In case of their retirement from service already, they will be entitled to the aforesaid back wages up till the date of retirement only. The management shall take into consideration any amount already paid to the workmen by way of interim relief while making the payment of back wages. Copy of the award be kept in CR 25/92. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 9th October, 2006).

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4450.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसूर मिनेरल लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निरीक्षणों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 36/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/17/2003-आई आर (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4450.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 36/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mysore Minerals Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-29012/17/2003-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 6th October, 2006

PRESENT:

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer.

C. R. No. 36/2003

Shri Mahalingappa,
S/o Rangappa,
Huchunnahalli Village,
Nonavinakere Hobli,
Tiptur Taluk, Tumkur Distt.,
Tumkur

... I Party

The Managing Director,
Mysore Minerals Limited,
No. 39, M. G. Road,
Bangalore-560001

... II Party

APPEARANCES:

1st Party : Shri K. T. Govinde Gowda, Advocate.

2nd Party : Shri N. Ganesh, Advocate.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-29012/17/2003-IR(M) dated 4th June, 2003 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Mysore Minerals Limited is justified in dismissing the services of Shri Mahalingappa, the workman with retrospective effect ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?"

2. The first party workman in his claim statement, while, challenging the order of dismissal passed against him as illegal and unjust, challenged the enquiry findings holding him guilty of the charges of misconduct of theft as perverse and also challenged enquiry proceedings as opposed to the principles of natural justice on the ground that there was no regular departmental enquiry conducted serving any charge sheet or show cause notice upon him and that the so called preliminary enquiry was a farce of enquiry etc.

3. The management by its counter statement justified its action in dismissing the first party from its services contending that a fair and proper departmental enquiry was conducted against the first party and on the basis of the enquiry findings holding him guilty of the charges he has been rightly and legally dismissed from service. It was also contended that since the misconduct was grave in nature, punishment of dismissal was proper and commensurate with the gravity of the charges.

4. Based on the respective pleadings of the parties with regard to the validity and legality or otherwise of the enquiry proceedings, this tribunal on 5-10-2004 framed the following Preliminary Issue :—

"Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party by the Second Party is fair and proper ?"

5. After due trial of the said issue, this tribunal by order dated 31-8-2006, recorded a finding against the management holding that the enquiry held against the first party by the Second Party is not fair and proper. Thereupon, the matter came to be posted to hear the learned counsels on merits of the case. On 12-9-2006, learned counsel for the management filed written arguments and whereas, learned counsel representing the first party being absent matter was taken as heard and posted this day for award.

6. In this case as could be read from the pleadings of the parties, on 20-3-1998 morning when all the mine workers has been taken to the Government Hospital,

Chennarayanapatna for X-ray and medical examination as required under mining statute, the first party workman along with another Mazdoor, Shri Nagaraj having consumed alcohol, abused and quarreled with the Assistant Manager, Shri Maheshwarappa and also tried to manhandle him in the premises of the Government Hospital. It is the case of the management that based on the aforesaid allegation enquiry was conducted against the first party and after the charge was proved, he was dismissed from service on the basis of the enquiry findings. The first party denied the aforesaid charge and the allegations made against him and took up the contention that no regular departmental enquiry was conducted and it was all done behind his back. Therefore, he challenged the enquiry proceedings, enquiry findings as well as the dismissal order passed against him.

7. As noted above, this tribunal by order dated 31-8-2006 has recorded a finding on the above said preliminary issue to the effect that the domestic enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is not fair and proper and the matter had come to be posted to hear the parties on merits. When the matter was taken up for hearing, as noted above, learned counsel for the management has filed his written arguments repeating almost all the contentions taken by the management in its Counter Statement. He has submitted those written arguments as if the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party or the allegations made against him with regard to the above said incident have been proved during the course of enquiry forgetting the fact that DE has been set aside. Since the enquiry itself has been set aside being found defective, the only way out for the management was to lead fresh evidence in order to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party that too, if there was any such contention already taken by the management in their counter statement seeking permission of this tribunal to lead fresh evidence in case of DE was held to be not fair and proper. Strangely enough, learned counsel for the management instead of making any attempt for leading fresh evidence in order to prove the charges of misconduct, filed his written arguments as if, the enquiry held against the first party was held to be fair and proper and that the evidence during course of enquiry is to be read in order to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party. In fact there was no evidence at all led during the course of enquiry as could be seen from the very report submitted by the enquiry officer. Therefore, since the enquiry held against the first party is held to be not fair and proper thereby meaning that there was no enquiry at all and since the management did not produce any evidence before this tribunal in order to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party, the only irresistible conclusion to be drawn would be that the management failed to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party. In the result, the dismissal order passed against the first party becomes nullity in the

eye of law and therefore, is liable to be set aside as illegal and void abinitio.

8. Since the dismissal order is held to be illegal, the natural corollary to be followed would be the reinstatement of the first party into the service of the management.

9. Coming to the question of back wages, as could be seen from the records, the dismissal order in question came to be passed on 27-8-1998 and whereas, the dispute by the first party was raised somewhere in the year 2003. There is absolutely no explanation offered by the first party in his claim statement as to what prevented him in not raising the dispute immediately after the dismissal order passed against him or at least within reasonable time thereafter. Therefore, no back wages can be paid to the first party from the date of the dismissal till the date of reference to this tribunal made on 4-6-2003. He shall be entitled to full back wages from the date of reference till the date of this award with continuity of service during this period. Accordingly, reference is answered and following award is passed.

AWARD

The management is directed to reinstate the first party in its service with full back wages from 1-6-2003 till the date of his reinstatement with continuity of service for the said period. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 6th October, 2006).

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4451.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसूर मिनरल लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निवेदकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलूर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 19/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/169/98-आई आर (विधि)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4451.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 19/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mysore Minerals Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-29012/169/98-IR(M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BANGALORE

Dated : 28th September, 2006

PRESENT :

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C. R. No. 19/1999

Shri Chikkanna,
S/o Chikkanna Nayaka,
Karya Village, Madapura Post,
Nanjangud Tq.,
Mysore.

... I Party

The Chairman and Managing Director,
Mysore Minerals Limited,
No. 39,M. G. Road,
Bangalore-560001.

... II Party

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide Order No. L-29012/169/98/IR(M) dated 1-3-1999 for adjudication on the following schedule

SCHEDULE

"Whether the termination of Shri Chikkanna, Mazdoor, Terali Mine by the management of M/s. Mysore Minerals Ltd. is justified ? If not, to what relief the disputant is entitled to ?"

2. When the matter stood for Evidence on Domestic Enquiry, it was taken up before the Lok Adalat and both the parties appeared and have settled the matter out of court and filed a Joint Memo to pass award accordingly in terms of the said memo. Hence, the following award.

"The Management is directed to reinstate the first party into service without any back wages, however with continuity of service forthwith. The above said Joint Memo shall form part of the Award."

(Dictated to D. C., transcribed by him, corrected and signed by me on 28th September, 2006).

A. R. SIDDQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4452.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत गोल्ड माइन्स लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक

अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 49/92) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-43012/18/91-आई आर (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4452.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 49/92) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-43012/18/91-IR(M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BANGALORE

Dated : 3rd October, 2006

PRESENT :

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C. R. No. 49/1992

Shri Krishnan,
(Since deceased rep. by LR's) residing at
2/A, Govindapadi Street,
Vettuvanam,
Via Pallikonda,
Vellore District.

... I Party

The Managing Director,
Bharath Gold Mines Ltd.,
Oorgaum,
K. G. F.

... II Party

APPEARANCES :

1st Party : B. D. Kuttappa, Advocate.

2nd Party : A. S. Bopanna, Advocate.

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide Order No. L-43012/18/91-IR(Misc.) dated 1-6-1992 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action taken by the management of BGML, KGF is justified in dismissing Shri Krishnan, a Machine Maistry, Nandydroog Mine, from service on 12-10-1978 on charges of theft ? If not, what relief he is entitled to ?"

2. The deceased Shri Krishnan was working as Machine Maistry in the petitioner company. It is alleged that on 26-4-1976 at about 8.00 p.m. while being searched by the special duty watchman in Henry's searching yard, the said Krishnan was found to be in unauthorized possession of gold bearing quarter pieces. The same amounted to a misconduct under Standing Order No. 14(1)(ii)(d) of the company and accordingly a show cause notice dated 3-5-1978 was issued to the said Krishnan. He gave his reply. Not being satisfied with the said reply, an enquiry was initiated against him. In the enquiry, both the parties have adduced evidence. On appreciation of the material on record, the Enquiry Officer found that the said Krishnan was guilty of all the charges leveled against him and submitted his report to the Disciplinary Authority. The Disciplinary Authority, accepting the said finding, by its order dated 19-12-1978 dismissed him from service w.e.f. 20-12-1978. The workman filed a suit in the civil court challenging the order of dismissal. After contest, the suit came to be dismissed. He preferred an appeal. In the appeal, he filed an application for permission to withdraw the suit, which was refused. Therefore, he approached the High Court in CRP 1546/90 and he was granted the permission sought for. Thus, though the Civil Court has recorded a finding that the misconduct alleged against the deceased Krishnan was established, by withdrawal of the suit, the judgment and decree was set at right. Thereafter the deceased Krishnan raised an industrial dispute. Conciliation had been failed, the appropriate Government has referred the dispute to this tribunal for adjudication.

3. The deceased Shri Krishnan in his Claim Statement contended that the charges leveled against him are very much vague and the alleged theft property is just worth Rs. 11.47 and that the management deliberately implicated him in a theft case to get rid of his services; that the misconduct alleged against him is not proved from the materials on record and at any rate the punishment of dismissal imposed upon him was grossly disproportionate to the gravity of the charges leveled against him keeping in view his unblemished service record of 33 years and therefore, the dismissal order passed against him is illegal and unjust and that the findings of the enquiry officer holding him guilty of the charges is perverse and arbitrary and the proceedings of the enquiry conducted against him suffered from violation of principles of natural justice.

4. As noted above, an issue on the point of Domestic Enquiry was raised by this tribunal and after due trial on the said issue, my learned Predecessor by his order dated 3-2-1999 recorded a finding to the effect that enquiry held against the first party (deceased) is fair and proper and the Preliminary Issue was answered in favour of the management. Thereupon, arguments were heard on merits i.e. on the point of alleged perversity of the findings and quantum of the punishment and by award dated 10-6-1999, my learned Predecessor allowed the reference holding that

the management was not justified in dismissing the deceased from services w.e.f. 12-10-1978 and that the deceased was eligible for reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages and since he had expired on 10-4-1998 the management was directed to calculate the service benefits and to pay them to the LRs of the deceased already brought on record.

5. It is aggrieved by this award, the management preferred a Writ Petition No. 34711/99 and his Lordship of Hon'ble High Court by order dated 10th June 2005 set aside the award passed by this tribunal with the following directions:—

- (i) Writ Petition is allowed;
- (ii) Impugned award passed by the Labour Court is hereby set aside;
- (iii) The entire matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for fresh consideration i.e. after the stage of holding the domestic enquiry as valid and proper. In other words, it shall decide the case on merits;
- (iv) If any amount has been paid in pursuance of the award of the Labour Court to the legal representative of the deceased workman by setting aside the impugned award, the said amount is not refundable to the petitioner.

6. After the remand I have heard the learned counsels for the respective parties and proceed to pass the following award.

7. Learned counsel for the management argued that the evidence oral and documentary produced by the management before the enquiry officer is very much sufficient and legal in establishing the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party and that the findings of the enquiry officer holding him guilty of the said charge is very much supported by the aforesaid evidence. Therefore, by no stretch of imagination it can be said that the findings suffered from perversity. On the point of punishment, learned counsel submitted that keeping in view the gravity of the misconduct, punishment of dismissal was justified and to support his arguments he cited a decision reported in 2002 LLJ page 1367.

8. Whereas, learned counsel for the first party submitted that evidence with regard to the theft charge was not cogent and satisfactory and the testimony of the witnesses for the management was not to be relied upon keeping in view the statement of the first party workman and the two witnesses he produced during the course of enquiry suggesting to the fact that the alleged theft property was not found in possession of the first party while taking his personal search at the relevant point of time. Next, he submitted that the first party since deceased and his LRs are brought on record, they deserved lenient view

particularly, in view of the fact that the first party was in the service of the management having good service record for a long period of 33 years.

9. After having gone through the records, more particularly, the oral and documentary evidence produced by the management so also the oral testimony of the first party and his two witnesses during the enquiry, find substance in the arguments advanced for the management that the charge of theft as alleged against the first party has been proved by sufficient and legal evidence. The statement of one Mr. Jairam, SD Watchman examined as a second witness for the management is very much important so also worth credence to speak to the fact that on 26-4-1978 when he was deputed for the work of Henry's searching yard, from 6.30 p.m. onwards, at about 8.15 p.m. about 10 workers came up from underground to the said searching yard to give search. There were 4 SD Watchmen including himself on searching duty. Three workers stood in front of him and the accused Shri Krishnan was the last person in his row. After having cleared the first two workers, when he started searching the accused (hereinafter called the first party) from top to bottom, his Pant was lowered and the Loin cloth he was holding using both his hands was asked to take out of his hands and then he (witness) pulled his Loin cloth down and at the time the GBQ piece in question fell down from the Loin cloth. He picked up the said piece from the ground and immediately called the Havildar at the foreman security room and on his arrival he explained the case and handed over the property to him. Afterwards, the Havildar returned with the Katcha Chit and that GBQ piece was deposited in the sample box. Little later SD Assistant Supervisor Hidayath Ali came on round and after examining the said GBQ piece having visible gold in it, he informed to the General Duty Supervisor and then Shri C. M. Jairam Naidu, the then General duty Supervisory came to the spot and sealed the GBQ Piece with the watch and ward seal of mine in the presence of Shri Nataraj, duty Foreman and Shri C. D. Muniswamy, 3rd shift banks man, S. D. Assistant Supervisor. Then he stated that at the time of his search of the first party S. D. Havaldar Shri Latchiram, Shri Togliram, Fatehsingh and Ramsaran were present at the search yard. The 3rd witness, Togliram, 4th Witness, Ramsaran and 5th Witness Fatehsingh as could be read from their statements, have corroborated the above said statement of Jairam on all the particulars of the case. All of them in one voice stated that they were present when the search of the first party was being taken place at the hands of the said Jairam and in no uncertain terms they have stated that when Jairam wanted the first party to lower down his Loin cloth he did it reluctantly and in the process the above said GBQ piece fell to the ground and was picked up by Mr. Jairam and then he was taken to the said Havildar along with the seized property. During the cross examination of all these four witnesses which was done by the first party personally, the only suggestion made to them was

that he himself removed his Loin cloth and was holding only his Pant and that no GBQ piece fell down from his Loin cloth. He however, did not dispute the fact that Jairam picked up the above said piece from the ground falling nearby his boots and that it was not the piece he was carrying. During the course of cross examination of these witnesses it was elicited that there was no ill will between them on one hand and the first party on the other hand. Therefore, from the above said oral testimony of the four witnesses who were on duty to search the workers and were present at the time when the first party was being searched by said Jairam, it becomes crystal clear that the property in question namely, the GBQ Piece was found on the person of the first party and it is during the course of his search, it fell from his person i.e. Loin cloth he was wearing and was picked up by the above said Jairam from nearby the boots of the first party. As seen above, in the cross examination of the aforesaid four witnesses, nothing worth was elicited from their mouth so as to have shaken their statements made in examination chief so as to doubt the veracity of their statements speaking to the fact that the property in question was found on the person of the first party.

10. As a defence evidence, the first party examined himself and his version relevant for the purpose was that when his search was done by said Jairam, he himself had lowered down the Loin cloth but no GBQ piece had fallen from his Loin cloth to be picked up by Jairam from the ground. He however, stated that the said GBQ piece was picked up by Jairam found falling near his boots when he approached his boots to put them on. In his answer to the question put by the enquiry officer he was unable to say whether the said piece was already there before his searching was commenced, as he did not observe the spot properly. The other two witnesses examined by the first party were one Mr. Subramanian and Mr. Nataraj T. N. They have spoken to the fact that personal search of the first party was done by Mr. Jairam but they were not the witnesses to the said personal search. They have stated that when the said SD Watchman Jairam approaching the boots of the deceased he found the above said GBQ piece lying on the ground, one foot away from the boots of the first party. In his answer to the question put by the enquiry officer he however, admitted that Jairam picked up the GBQ piece from the ground and it is at that time only he saw the GBQ piece. Similar is the statement of said Nataraj. He was also not the eye witness to the personal search of the first party but saw the said SD Watchman Jairam picking up the GBQ piece from the ground. Therefore, as argued for the management, there was sufficient and legal evidence in the oral testimony of the aforesaid four witnesses corroborated by the other two witnesses to suggest that said GBQ piece was found on the person of the first party when his search was being done by the said SD Watchman, Jairam. This evidence of said Jairam has been very much considered

and discussed by the enquiry officer along with the evidence of the other 3 witnesses who were the direct and eye witnesses to the incident and he rightly came to the conclusion that in their evidences charge of theft against the first party has been very much established. He rightly rejected the defence evidence on the ground that they have not seen actually the search of the first party going on. Infact as noted above, they have also spoken to the fact that GBQ piece was lying on the ground and it was picked up by Mr. Jairam after having made search of the first party.

11. As noted above, there was absolutely no reason for the enquiry officer not to act upon the oral testimony of the said Jairam and the other three eye witnesses particularly, when it was elicited in their cross examination by the first party himself that there was no ill will between him on one hand and the said four witnesses on the other hand. His contention that he was implicated falsely in the case on hand has to be rejected, as undisputedly no motive was attributed by him to any of the management witnesses to implicate him in a false case. In the result, there cannot be any hesitation to come to the conclusion that findings of the enquiry officer are supported by cogent and valid reasonings which in turn are supported by sufficient and legal evidence brought on record during the course of enquiry. Therefore, it must be held that charge of misconduct leveled against the first party has been proved.

12. Now coming to the quantum of the punishment, the first party is said to have expired somewhere in the year 1988 itself. His LRs are brought on record. The contention of the first party that he had an unblemished service record for about a period of 33 years has not been refuted by the management nor it is the case of the management that the first party was involved in any case of misconduct while he was in the service of the management during the aforesaid period. Therefore, it is under these facts and circumstances, it appears to me that ends of justice will be met, if the punishment of dismissal imposed upon the first party is converted into the punishment of termination of his services so that his LRs, at least, could get service benefits for the services rendered by the first party up till the date he was dismissed from service. Accordingly, the reference is answered and the following award is passed :

AWARD

The punishment of dismissal dated 12-10-1978 imposed upon the first party is hereby modified with the punishment of termination of his services. The LRs of the deceased shall be entitled to the service benefits due to the deceased first party for the period of services he rendered under the management apart from the payment of 25% of the back wages from 12-10-1978 to 31-12-1985 already made to the LRs as per orders of the High Court dated 30-9-1999 in WP No. 34711/99. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 3rd October, 2006).

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4453.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सीमेन्ट कारपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, सी. जी. आई. टी.-2 के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 56/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/91/2002-आई आर (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4453.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 56/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, CGIT-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Cement Corporation of India Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-29011/91/2002-IR(M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, NEW DELHI

PRESENT:

Shri R. N. Rai, Presiding Officer

I. D. No. 56/2003

In the matter of:

Shri Prakash Veer Tomar and 6 Ors.,
C/o The President,
Cement Corporation of India Limited,
Delhi Grinding Unit Workers' Union,
Okhla Industrial Area Phase-I,
New Delhi-110020

Versus

The General Manager,
Cement Corporation of India Limited,
Delhi Cement Grinding Unit,
Okhla Industrial Area,
Phase-I, New Delhi-110020

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-29011/91/2002-IR(M) Central Government dt. 1-4-2003 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder :

“Whether the demand of the CCI/DGU Workers’ Union in relation to regularization of the services of Ex. Temporary Clerks, namely S/Shri Prakash Veer Romar, Rai Singh Chaprana, Raj Kumar Tomar, Raj Kumar, Eknath Singh, S. N. Pathak and Rajinder Kumar who worked in the Delhi Cement Grinding Unit of Cement Corporation of India, Okhla Industrial Area, New Delhi since July 1991 is just, fair and legal ? If yes, what relief the workmen are entitled to and from what date ?”

The workmen applicants have filed claim statement. In the claim statement it has been stated that the Central Government has vide its order of reference No. L-29011/91/2002-IR(M) dated 1-4-2003 referred an Industrial Dispute to this Hon’ble Tribunal-cum-Labour Court for adjudication existing between the above noted parties with following terms of reference :

“Whether the demand of the CCI/DGU Workers’ Union in relation to regularization of services of Ex. Temporary Clerks, namely S/Shri Prakash Veer Romar, Rai Singh Chaprana, Raj Kumar Tomar, Raj Kumar, Eknath Singh, S. N. Pathak and Rajinder Kumar who worked in the Delhi Cement Grinding Unit of Cement Corporation of India, Okhla Industrial Area, New Delhi since July 1991 is just, fair and legal ? If yes, what relief the workmen are entitled to and from what date ?”

That the workman whose names is shown in order of reference have been employed with M/s. Cement Corporation of India Limited, Grinding Unit, Okhla Industrial Area, New Delhi-110020 a company registered as a wholly owned Government of India Company. The details of the workmen services whose name appeared in the order of reference are as under :—

S. No.	Name	F. Name	Post Held	Dt. of Joining
1.	Prakash Veer Tomar	Harbans Singh	Courier-cum-Messenger (Ad hoc) Civil and at present in Marketing	2-6-1990
2.	Raj Singh Chaprana	Nepal Singh	Clerk (Ad hoc) in M. M. Department	1-9-1992
3.	Raj Kumar Tomar	Om Prakash	Courier-cum-Messenger (Ad hoc) in Civil Deptt.	16-6-1990
4.	Raj Kumar	Sukhbir Singh	Courier-cum-Messenger (Ad hoc) in Civil Deptt. and at present in Store M. M. Deptt.	21-5-1990
5.	Eknath Singh	Late Ram Narayan Singh	Clerk-cum-Messenger in Production and Marketing Department	May 1990
6.	S. N. Pathak	Shambhunath Pathak	Clerk (Ad hoc)	11-4-1991
7.	Rajinder Kumar	Jagdish Prasad	Helper	2-2-1996

The above said workers have been continuously working from their respective dates of joining with artificial break and they are being treated as daily wages, ad hoc/ temporary workers by the management with an intention to deprive them of their rights to get the same scale of pay, wages and other employment which are being given to regular and permanent employees discharging same and similar duties. The workmen shown above were and are being paid the minimum wages fixed by the Delhi Government as revised from time to time. The equal pay for

equal work and other facilities and benefits which are being paid to the permanent employee/workmen of management corporation are totally denied to the above named workmen.

That the workers whose names have appeared in the order of reference have been engaged by the management corporation from last 10 to 12 years and it is evident from the fact that the workmen who are continuously working with the management corporation are permanently required by the management corporation but just to deprive them from various facilities and benefits being paid to permanent

employee of the management corporation treated these employees as daily rated or ad hoc/temporary workers.

That the workmen are engaged at work as clerk and other post with the management corporation and the work which they are performing the work is connected with the principal function of the Management Corporation and perennial in nature. The workmen are in regular employment.

That the so called ad hoc/temporary employment basis is device of exploiting of the workmen. The work is available throughout the year round the clock as the workmen have been employed throughout the year and not for one or two years but from last 10 to 12 years. The so called ad hoc/temporary basis appointment is unilateral as the workmen had no other choice except to accept the employment under the compelling circumstance of great unemployment problem in the country, just for survival of self and dependent in word. Such ad hoc/temporary arrangement in compelling circumstances cannot be termed contract with free consent in absence of free consent to an agreement does not make such agreement as valid contract having binding force. Even otherwise in the matter of such employment the terms of contract cannot be applied mathematically or mechanically as in commercial matters. In the service matters the socio-economic aspect is involved. The human lives are on peril. An arrangement be it called ad hoc/temporary/contract or daily wages is to be read along with the principle of natural justice, fair play, equity, justice and good conscience not arbitrary or unreasonable. Thus this so called employment of ad hoc/temporary basis is a fraud, cheating a device of exploitation and flouting the provision of the ID Act, 1947, the equal remuneration Act, Articles 14, 16, 21, 23 and 39(d) of the Constitution of India. The right of livelihood has been recognized by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as fundamental right of the citizen flowing from the Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The management corporation always needed the services of workmen continuously and regularly but to avoid the payment of the legal dues of regular clerk and other regular post to the workmen, the management has adopted the method of flouting laws, as if the management is sincerely following the labour laws and the provision of the Constitution of India. The non-regularization of the services of the workmen as clerk, messenger or peon or of the other post in proper pay scale is wholly, illegal, bad, unjust and mala fide.

That the workmen have been working at site of the management under direct control and supervision of the officials of management. Necessary instructions, advice, action are being given to the workmen.

That the workmen joined the services in the year 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1996 (approximately 10 years) as clerks, courier, messenger etc. in Delhi Grinding Unit of management corporation. They were provided all the services to the management corporation and were

transferred from one department to another department on the basis of exigencies of work. The workmen are discharging the work of a permanent and perennial nature which are primary essential for the management corporation to continue its activities. The contribution to provident fund account etc. and bonus are directly made by the corporation.

That the workmen are discharging duties of permanent and perennial nature, however the management corporation has not treated the concerned workmen as permanent employees though they have been engaged for the last 7 to 13 years in order to deprive these workmen of their rights to getting salary/wages/employment which are being paid to regular or permanent employees discharging same or similar duties. This action on the part of the management corporation amounts to unfair labour practice as has been envisaged in the ID Act, 1947, Schedule V enacted under section 2 (r)(a) of the ID Act. The Clause 10 of the schedule V reads as under :—

“10. To employ workmen as “Badlis” “Casuals” or “Temporary” and to continue them as such for years, with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen.”

That the workmen concerned have also deprived of their legal right to get same scale of the pay and other benefits which have been given to the regular employees employed by the management corporation. Admittedly it cannot be said by any stretch of imagination that the work which the concerned workmen have been continuously doing is of intermittent and sporadic type. On the contrary the fact that the workmen have been continuously working with the management corporation for a period of more than 7 to 12 years proves beyond any doubt that the work of the workmen concerned is of permanent and perennial nature and the same is closely connected with the main activities of the management corporation. In this regard objection were raised by the auditor of the management corporation is regards to these ad hoc workers and the auditors also raised the question mark about making permanent services of junior persons instead of senior persons.

That the workmen concerned and other workmen filed a writ petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide CWP No. 5026 of 1999 when in spite of the laps of substantial period the services of the workmen were not regularized. The Hon'ble Delhi High Court after hearing the parties directed the workmen to approach the appropriate authority provided under ID Act, 1947. The operative parts of the order dated 18-12-2001 which is last para of the order reads as under :

“The Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Steel Authority of India's case (Supra) has recently opined that in the judgment they have used the expression “Industrial Adjudicator” by design as determination of the question aforementioned

requires inquiry into disputes question of facts which cannot conveniently be made by the High Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. Therefore in such case the appropriate authority to go into these issues will be Industrial Tribunal/Court whose determination will be amenable to judicial review."

For all these reasons the writ petition is not maintainable and is dismissed. Its rejection by these orders would not in any way preclude, fetter, restrict or affect the jurisdiction of the Industrial Adjudicator if any when its jurisdiction is invoked by the petitioner.

That the workmen concerned alongwith other workmen filed an LPA No. 24/2002 which was withdrawn by the appellant on the ground the appellant would like to file a review petition before the Single Judge. The said LPA was dismissed as withdrawn.

That thereafter a review petition had been filed by the workmen concerned alongwith other workmen. The review petition has dismissed on the ground that as per the grave-men of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Steel Authority of India Limited and Others Vs. National Union Water Front Workers and Other under Industrial Disputes Act is available to them.

That a Civil Writ Petition was also filed by the Union in Hon'ble Delhi High Court with a prayer to direct the CCI Corporation to not sale out or transfer the ownership of the units belonging to the Corporation without fixing the liability of the ad hoc employees and contract labourers. The said writ petition was disposed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi with the direction that the petitioner union may raise these issues before the Industrial Adjudicator.

That thereafter the C.C.I.D.G.U. workers union raised a dispute of regularization of the concerned workmen before the conciliation officer but due to the adamant attitude of the management corporation no settlement arrived and thus a failure report was sent to the appropriate government by the conciliation officer which resulted into the present reference. The union also made representation to the Hon'ble Labour Minister, Central in this regard.

That non-regularization of the workmen concerned by the management corporation even though there is a permanent need and sanctioned post for the employment of such person in order to execute the functions and activities of the management corporation is illegal, unconstitutional and unfair labour practice.

That the management corporation has also regularized the services of some persons who were juniors to the petitioners.

That the union has espoused the cause of its member and the union has raised the present Industrial Dispute to the effect that the action of the management corporation in

appointing the workmen herein on ad hoc/temporary basis with artificial breaks in services is unjust, improper, mala fide, illegal, unfair labour practice and contrary to the settled law on the following amongst other grounds.

Because the management corporation has adopted an unfair labour practice by employing workmen as badlies, casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen in meeting its requirements by engaging the employees on ad hoc/temporary basis. The experience over the last about 7 to 13 years is indicative of the fact that the services of the workmen are definitely required for the day to day functioning of the managment corporation.

Because it is unfair to take away from the right created in the favour of the workmen herein because of pecuniary implications of the corporation concerned.

Because the requirement of workmen concerned for management is perennial in nature.

Because the management corporation has been resorting to making ad hoc/temporary appointment with a view to exploit the concerned workmen.

Because the workmen herein have become overage after having worked with the management for several years approximately over a decade and cannot seek employment elsewhere.

Because the management corporation has been flouting the provisions of ID Act, Articles 14, 16, 21, 23, 39(d) of the Constitution of India. The equal remuneration Act, the principle of equal pay for equal work and principles of natural justice.

Because the management corporation has regularized the services of some persons who were juniors to the workmen herein and thus violative of principle of equity.

The management has filed written statement. In the written statement it has been stated that the present dispute is not an industrial dispute as defined u/s 2(k) of the ID Act and accordingly the present proceedings are outside the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal. The dispute has neither been espoused by a union having representative character qua the replying management nor has the support of substantial number of workmen employed with the management. Accordingly the present proceedings are liable to be rejected on this ground alone.

That some of the claimants are seeking regularization as Courier-cum-Messenger. It is stated that there is no such sanctioned post with the replying management and thus there is no case for regularization on this post.

That the claimants do not have the requisite qualification for the posts on which the regularization is sought for. As the claimant do not have the requisite

qualifications, no question of regularization arises. In the event the claimants are seeking regularization they must show by way of positive evidence that they are qualified for the post on which regularization is sought for.

That the CCI Limited is a sick Industrial Undertaking. Under Sick Industrial Companies (Special provisions) Act, 1985 (SICA). As per the order of the Govt./BIFR there is complete ban on further employment/recruitment. The process of privatization is in a very advanced stage of finalization. The Central Government has also decided to close down seven non-operating plants out of ten units on the ground of un-viability in the event these are not sold. In an attempt to reduce the manpower, the management has also rolled back the retirement age of its employees from 60 years to 58 years. By way of VRS the strength of employees have also been drastically reduced from 4800 to 1620 during the last three years. As there is no production of cement at Delhi Grinding Unit, there is hardly any work for the claimants. As and when they come, they keep on sitting idle. The management is unable to bear any further financial burden due to resource crunch. There is thus, no case for regularization in favour of the claimants even on merits.

That the alleged CCI/DGU Workers Union has moved a memorandum dated 6th September, 2003 before replying management seeking severance of the alleged relationship with the management by getting compensation at par with VRS in vogue with employees of CCI Limited. Thereafter, the alleged union has also moved the Labour Department of the Central Government. Once the claimants themselves are seeking severance of the alleged relationship with the replying management, no question of their regularization would arise. On this ground also the present proceedings are liable to be dismissed. A copy of the memorandum dated 06-09-2003 is enclosed as Annexure-I.

That as already submitted, Delhi Cement Grinding Unit (DCGU) is lying closed since February 1999. There is no production for the last 4 years. The claimants have no work at all to do at the unit. The claimants were engaged on ad hoc basis at one time or the other in exigencies of the requirement but after suspension of operation there is hardly any work for their gainful utilization.

That it is submitted that in view of the provisions of Section 22 of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special provisions) Act, 1985 (SICA), order of reference and consequently the present proceedings are without jurisdiction. In any event the proceedings are liable to be stayed and claimants directed to move the appropriate authority for permission to proceed in the present case. Until such permission is granted by the appropriate authority, proceedings and the consequent award shall be without jurisdiction and void ab initio.

That the alleged date of joining shown against different names is fictitious and denied. None of the

claimants was engaged prior to September 1992 and the claimants Nos. 6 & 7 were engaged as late as December 1996 and March 1997.

That it is denied that the claimants have been continuously working with the replying management as alleged. The claimants have not been working continuously with the replying management and have been absenting at their will for long periods some time extending to month. The claimants cannot claim parity with the regular employees of the management who were appointed in accordance with the prescribed norms and after open competition. The principle of "equal pay for equal work" has no application in the facts and circumstances of this case.

That the dates of appointment given by the claimants are fictitious and imaginary. Further as already submitted there is no work at all for the claimants and thus the question of permanent requirement or job being of perennial nature does not arise. The DCGU Plant at Delhi is lying closed for four years and the claimants are not doing any work at all. It is denied that the management/corporation is seeking to deny any benefit to the claimants. All benefits as available to the claimants in accordance with the law are being paid to them.

That there is no production in 7 out of 10 units of the respondent management. The CCI Limited is surviving on the basis of non-plan financial support by way of loan from the Government. The management/corporation has no financial capability to take any further financial burden. As already submitted that there is no production at all at DCGU (Delhi Cement Grinding Unit) nor there is any perennial requirement for persons such as claimants.

That it is denied that there is any exploitation of claimants in any manner as alleged or otherwise. There is no work available with the replying management for the claimants. As submitted the claimants were employed by the then management in most arbitrary manner without following the requisite norms and at the instance of outside agencies. The claimants are not doing any work for the last four years. Even prior to that their work was far from satisfactory. The claimants do not fulfill the requisite qualifications for various posts as already submitted. In the circumstances, no question of regularization arises in any manner. The action of the replying management is legal, valid and justified in all respects. The true and correct position has already been submitted.

That the allegations mentioned in paragraphs under reply are fictitious. There is no work for claimants in any of the establishments of the management as there is no induction.

That there is no requirement for employees such as claimants as there is no production at all at Delhi Unit. It is denied that there is any unfair labour practice on the part of the replying management as alleged or otherwise.

That there is no work for claimants as there is no production at all at Delhi Unit. Since there is no work there is no question of work being of permanent or perennial nature as alleged or otherwise.

However it is submitted that replying management shall reply on the order of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court to submit the true and correct import thereof.

That the conciliation proceedings failed as the claimants who were not willing to discuss the difficulties faced by the management. As and when there was regular vacancy the same was filled in accordance with norms. It was also open for claimants to make themselves available for consideration in the event they were so advised and subject to fulfilling the requisite qualification. It is submitted that there is no espousal of the case of claimants. The present proceedings are liable to be rejected on this ground.

The workmen applicants have filed rejoinder. In their rejoinder they have reiterated the averments of their claim statement and have denied most of the paras of the written statement. The management has also denied most of the paras of the claim statement.

Evidence of both the parties has been taken.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record.

It was submitted from the side of the workmen that Shri Prakash Veer Tomar, Raj Kumar Tomar, Raj Kumar, Eknath Singh were engaged on temporary basis from 1990 and Shri S. N. Pathak were engaged on temporary basis w.e.f. 11-04-1991, Shri Raj Singh Chaprana w.e.f. 01-09-1992 and Shri Rajender Kumar w.e.f. 02-02-1996.

It was submitted that all the workmen have been working continuously from respective dates of their joining with artificial breaks and they are being treated as daily wages, ad hoc/temporary workers by the management with an intention to deprive them of their rights to get the same scale of pay, wages and other employment which are being given to regular and permanent employees discharging same and similar duties. The workmen have not been paid equally at par with permanent and regular workmen.

The workmen are performing the duties which are of continuous and regular nature. The work is of perennial nature. These workmen have been kept ad hoc and temporary for long 10-12 years to deprive them of the benefits of regular employees. They remained engaged under the compelling circumstances of great unemployment problem in the Country just for the survival of their family. Such a contract of employment is not a valid contract in view of the compelling circumstances of unemployment problem in the Country. The workmen continued working for their survival and that of their family members. The workmen are entitled to equal pay for equal work.

It was submitted from the side of the management that in view of Uma Devi 2006 SCC (L & S) 753 no question of regularization arises. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the same case has also emphasized that the Courts/Tribunals in their sympathy for the handful ad hoc/casual employees before it cannot ignore the claims for equal opportunity for the teeming millions of the country who are also seeking employment. In such case, the Courts/Tribunals should adhere to the Constitutional norms and should not water down constitutional requirement in any way.

It has been held in 2006 SCC (L & S) 753, "one aspect needs to be clarified. There may be cases where irregular appointment (not illegal appointments) as explained in S. V. Narayanappa, R. N. Nanjundappa and B. N. Nagarajan and referred to in para 15 above of duly qualified persons in duly sanctioned vacant posts might have been made and the employees have continued to work for ten years or more but without the intervention of orders of the courts or of tribunals"

It has been held in (1992) 4 SCC 118, "Regularization—Ad hoc/Temporary govt. employee—Principles laid down—Those eligible and qualified and continuing in service satisfactorily for long period have a right to be considered for regularization—Long continuance in service gives rise to a presumption about need for a regular post—But mere continuance for one year or so does not in every case raise such a presumption — Govt. should consider feasibility of regularization having regard to the particular circumstances with a positive approach and an empathy for the concerned person."

"Labour Law—Regularization—Work charged/casual/daily wage workers—In case of long continuance in service presumption for regular need of service would arise obliging authority concerned to consider with a positive mind feasibility of regularization—Statutory/public corporations should also follow suit."

It was submitted from the side of the management that a Court or a Tribunal has no power to direct regularization of services of ad hoc employees. It can at the most direct the management to frame a scheme for regularization of services of the employees and consider such ad hoc employees in accordance with the scheme after considering vacancies, qualifications, seniority among similarly placed employees and past record including attendance etc.

It was submitted from the side of the management that the claimants as per their own case were engaged between 1990 to 1996. The management was about to take action to disengage the services of the claimants as back as during the year 1999 i.e. immediately after the production of cement stopped at DTU. The claimants anticipating disengagement of their services approached the Hon'ble Delhi High Court and obtained stay order. Thereafter, on

account of continuous litigation at various forums including the instant reference the replying management could not disengage the claimants as contemplated. Since the claimants retained their engagement on account of interim orders of the court and on account of various industrial disputes raised including the present dispute, the claimants cannot seek regularization even otherwise.

It was submitted from the side of the management that claim for regularization is not bona fide. Admittedly on 06-09-2003 the CCI DGU Workers Union moved a representation before the ALC (C) in which it is stated that they are not willing to work with the CCI Limited but only want voluntary retirement benefits equivalent to the regular employees. Admittedly the representation has been moved before RLC (C) with the consent of all the claimants in the instant case. Ex WW1, RM-1 is the copy of the resolution/memorandum. Since the claimants do not want to work with the management and are merely fighting the case to obtain VR benefits, the case is malafide and is liable to be thrown out without any relief.

It was further submitted by the management that CCI Limited has been declared a sick company by the Board of Industrial and Financial Reconstruction under Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provision) Act, 1985 (SICA). The Hon'ble BIFR has imposed ban on fresh recruitment for all the units, headquarters and marketing offices of CCI Limited vide order dated 12-06-1998. There has been no recruitment after 12-06-1998 at CCI. Once the competent statutory authority has imposed ban on recruitment, an award contrary to the statutory order of competent authority cannot be made.

It was further submitted from the side of the management that admittedly there has been no production at all since February 1999 at DGU. Thus there is no work at all for the claimants at DGU. Even these days the claimants keep on sitting idle without any work, as and when they come to DGU. Since there is no work all the claimants are being utilized in security department though there is no requirement of such large strength of security personnel. Since there is no work at all, no question of regularization would arise.

It has been further submitted by the management that the management has no capability to pay any salary to the claimants. Detailed facts regarding precarious financial position of the CCI Limited have been stated in the written statement and in the evidence led before this Hon'ble Tribunal which have not been disputed nor can be disputed by the claimants. There is no production at DGU and thus there is no income on account of any manufacturing activities at DGU. Since there is no manufacturing activity at DGU the management has been forced to rent out substantial portion of DGU premises to another Government of India Corporation, namely Container Corporation of India Limited. The amount thus received is being utilized for

bare minimum necessary expenses for up keep of the plant and meeting out other administrative expenses. The management has also been getting grant from the government by way of loan. In these circumstances it would not be in the public interest to regularize the services of the claimants and place further financial burden on the Public Exchequer. The management is already being forced to pay salary out of public money without any corresponding benefit to public by way of production. Moreover, the management of CCI Limited in pursuance of the order of the Hon'ble BIFR has already moved an application dated 24-05-2006 before the appropriate Government for permission to close down the undertaking of DGU. On this ground also no case for regularization is made.

It is submitted from the side of the management that the claimants Shri P. V. Tomar, Raj Kumar Tomar, Raj Kumar Singh and Eknath Singh are seeking regularization as Clerk-cum-Messenger/Courier-cum-Messenger. There are no such posts, much less sanctioned post with the management and thus no question of regularization would arise.

It is submitted from the side of the management that undisputedly there is no parity between the regular employees and the claimants. Regular employees were appointed after following prescribed procedure which inter alia require proper circulation of the post, calling of applications and interview by the duly constituted selection committee. But no such procedure was followed, in respect of claimant. Further admittedly claimants have been working at DGU all along whereas regular employees of the corporation have been transferred to other units of the corporation. Even otherwise there is inherent distinction between the nature of work and the responsibility of employees working on regular basis and ad hoc employees. Thus principles of equal pay for equal work has no applicability to facts and circumstances of the present case. Therefore, the claimants cannot seek wages or salary equal to their regularly appointed counterparts.

It is submitted from the side of the management that there has been no proper espousal of the dispute. CCI DGU workers union has no representative character qua the replying management nor this claim has the support of substantial number of workmen employed with the management. This case involves inherent conflict of interest among various employees, as it may effect the inter se seniority of employees. Thus the requirement of espousal is a must and cannot be brushed aside as mere technicality.

The argument regarding espousal is misconceived in view of amended Section 2A, ID Act, 1947. Any individual employee or group of employees can raise Industrial Dispute. This contention of the management is meritless.

The question regarding requisite qualification for the post is also not substantial. Qualifications etc. should be

considered at the initial state of engagement. The workmen have been working at various posts since 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1996 so at this stage requisite qualifications are immaterial. The workmen have obtained experience by long work. This argument is also not tenable.

The workmen have not been taken through regular recruitment procedure. They are purely ad hoc and temporary and they have been continued after artificial breaks. Their work is continuous as artificial breaks are due to no fault of the workmen.

The work is no longer of continuous and regular nature. There is ban for further recruitment but these workmen are not precluded from engagement on the basis of further ban. The DGU is in precarious financial position. The management has applied for permission to close down the Industry before the competent authority. The management is facing financial burden due to resource crunch. It is admitted that there is no production of Cement after 1999. It is also admitted that these workmen have been continued in view of the orders of the Courts from 1999 till date.

In Uma Devi's case the Constitution Bench has categorically laid down that in case workmen have been working continuously for 10 years and not on the basis of orders of Courts, their cases may be considered for regularization. In the instant case the unit was declared sick in 1999. These workmen have been continued in view of stay orders. The workmen themselves have moved application for getting compensation at par with VRS invoked with employees of CCI Limited. So the claimants are seeking severance of relationship for getting VRS. There is indeed no work for the claimants.

The present proceedings are not without jurisdiction. The claimants have been taken on ad hoc basis but they have been continued for a long period. They have become over age. Their services cannot be regularized in view of the Uma Devi's case. They have rendered services for a substantial period and they have become over age. They cannot be given pay at par with regular employees as there is no accountability and responsibility on ad hoc and temporary employees. So they cannot be given status of regular employees. They are not entitled to get equal pay for equal work.

The management has continued them for long 6 years period of time. They are entitled to get compensation of four years wages in view of their long tenure of service in case the management finds their retrenchment necessary. The wages are to be calculated prorata wages of 2005.

The workmen themselves have admitted that there is no work in Delhi Unit. They have been engaged for only Delhi Unit on ad hoc basis. So they cannot be transferred to the other units as regular employees.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case all the workmen are entitled for compensation equal to four years wages in case of retrenchment.

The management is directed to make payment of four years wages by way of compensation at the time of retrenchment of these employees.

The reference stands replied thus.

Award is given accordingly.

Dated: 18-10-2006

R. N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4454.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार राजा ग्रेनाइट क्वारिज के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय एर्नाकुलम, कोची के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 14/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/59/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

बी.एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th October, 2006

S.O. 4454.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 14/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ernakulam, Kochi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Raja Granite Quarry and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-10-2006.

[No. L-29011/59/2005-IR(M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

Shri P.L. Norbert, B.A., LL.B., Presiding Officer

(Monday the 16th day of October, 2006)

I.D. No. 14/2006

V.V. Shammugham,

S/o. Velayudhan, Valiyaveetil House,

Vengola P.O. Perumbavoor,

Ernakulam.

... Workman

Adv. Shri Alexander Joseph

E. V. Rajan,
Proprietor,
M/s Raja Granite Quarry,
Vengola, P.O., Perumbavoor,
Ernakulam

... Management

Adv. Shri Mathew Abraham

AWARD

This is a reference made by Central Government under Section 10 (1)(d) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication. The reference is :

"Whether the action of the management of M/s Raja Granites in denying employment to Shri V.V. Shanmugam w.e.f 6-12-2004 justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. The facts in brief are as follows :

The workman was a worker in a granite quarry run by Shri E. V. Rajan, the proprietor of M/s. Raja Granite, Vengola since 1990. He was working continuously till 20-7-2004. At that time there was an accident in the neighbouring quarry. Hence the management closed down 'Raja Granite' for some time. The work was re-started on 6-12-2004. The workman reported for work on the same day. According to the workman he was denied work by the management. The workman was not given a notice of termination or service benefits. He was also not given bonus. The termination is illegal and he is entitled to be reinstated with all consequential benefits. The management in the written statement contended that the quarry was started only in the year 2002. It is true that there was an accident in the neighbouring quarry. But the 'Raja Granite' was not closed down. It was functioning in 2004 also. There is no employer-employee relationship between the workman and the management. In fact the claimant is working in some other quarry. He is trying to make illegal gain by raising a false claim. The management is employing less than 10 workers per day in Raja Granite. All statutory registers and records are maintained by the management. The workman is not entitled to be reinstated or to get any benefit from the management.

3. In the light of the above pleadings the following points arise for consideration :

- (1) Whether the claimant was a workman under Raja Granite?
- (2) If so, is the termination illegal?

When the matter came up for evidence the management remained absent continuously. Hence the workman was examined as WW1 and an experience certificate issued by the management was marked as Ext. W1.

5. Point Nos. (1) & (2) :

The contentions of the workman that he was working in Raja Granite belonging to the management since 1990

and that he was terminated from service on 6-12-2004 without giving him either a notice or compensation in lieu of notice are substantiated by the oral testimony of the workman as WW1. He has also produced Ext. W1 certificate of experience issued by Raja Granite on 13-7-2004. The certificate is to the effect that Shri V.V. Shanmugham (the workman) had worked in 'Raja Granite' for the past four years and his remuneration per day is Rs. 225. The certificate is signed by Proprietor Shri E. V. Rajan. The testimony of WW1 and the documentary evidence of Ext. W1 are unchallenged. Therefore I find that the claimant was a worker under the management. He has worked at any rate not less than 4 years before the dispute arose. He is a workman coming u/s. 2(S) of I.D. Act. He was not given a notice of termination before denying employment. He was also not given compensation in lieu of notice. He was also not given retrenchment compensation according to the number of years he had worked under the management as contemplated u/s. 25F of I.D. Act. The termination, therefore, is illegal. It follows therefore that he is entitled to be reinstated with back wages.

6. In the result an award is passed allowing the claim of the workman and finding that the action of the management in denying employment to workman Shri V.V. Shanmugham w.e.f. 6-12-2004, is illegal and unjustified and he is entitled to be reinstated with back wages from 6-12-2004 and all other consequential benefits. No cost. The award will take effect one month after its publication by the Government.

Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 16th day of October, 2006.

P. L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer

APPENDIX

Witness for the Workman :

WW1 : Shri V.V. Shanmugham.

Witness for the Management :

NIL.

Exhibits for the Workman :

W1 : Photostat copy of certificate issued by the management.

Exhibits for the Management :

NIL.

नई दिल्ली, 31 अक्टूबर, 2006

का. आ. 4455.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम

न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एलसी/आर/195/93) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-10-2006 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/83/92-आई आर (डी यू)]
सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 31st October, 2006

S.O. 4455.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/195/93) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 31-10-2006.

[No. L-40012/83/92-IR (DU)]
SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/195/93

Shri C.M. Singh, Presiding Officer

Shri Ram Sai,
S/o Shri Bed Ram Meyana,
Gram : Soniyapara,
PO Saragaon, via Baraduar,
Distt. Bilaspur-495 001 ... Workman

Versus

The Sub Divisional Officer (Telegraphs),
Department of Telecommunications,
PO & Distt. Bilaspur-495 001. ... Management

AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of October, 2006

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-40012/83/92-IR(DU) dated 11-9-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of SDO (Telegraphs), Bilaspur in retrenching Shri Ram Sai S/o Shri Bed Ram w.e.f. 10-10-90 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. The case of the workman in brief is as follows. Workman Shri Ram Sai had been in the employment of the management w.e.f. 13-3-74 to 15-10-90 as casual labour. His services were terminated by the management vide office

order No. ESJ-74/9 dated 10/90. In the said order, the workman was shown in the service since 1974 to 31-12-89. He worked with the management for more than 240 days in the preceding calendar year and therefore his termination is bad in law. The management has not complied with the mandatory provision of Sec-25 of the I.D. Act and therefore the order of termination is void-ab-initio. It is prayed that the order of termination be declared as void and he be reinstated in services with all back wages.

2. The order dated 14-9-06 on the ordersheet of this proceeding reveals that inspite of sufficient service of notices on both parties, none of them put in appearance. Under the circumstances this tribunal was left with no option but to close the reference for no dispute award and therefore the reference was closed for award.

3. Inspite of sufficient service of notices, the parties failed to appear before this tribunal. It clearly indicates that the workman as well as the management has no interest in this reference proceeding. Under the circumstances, it shall be just and proper to pass no dispute award without any order as to costs.

4. In view of the above no dispute award is passed in this reference without any order as to costs.

5. Copy of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour as per rules.

C.M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 2 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4456.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप धारा-(3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 16 नवम्बर, 2006 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 [धारा-76 की उप धारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है] के उपबन्ध पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

"मैदिनीपुर पश्चिम जिला के खड़गपुर नगर पुलिस स्टेशन और खड़गपुर स्थानीय पुलिस स्टेशन के अन्तर्गत नगर पालिका और गैर-नगर पालिका (खड़गपुर रेलवे बन्दोबस्त)"

[सं. एस-38013/58/2006-एस एस-1]

एस. डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 2nd November, 2006

S.O. 4456.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 16th November, 2006 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Section 44

and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter-V and VI [except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the state of West Bengal namely :

“Municipal and Non-Municipal (Kharagpur Railway Settlement) area under Kharagpur Town P.S. and Kharagpur Local P.S. of District-Medinipur (West)”.

[No. S-38013/58/2006-SS-1]
S. D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4457.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप धारा-(3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 16 नवम्बर, 2006 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 [धारा-76 की उप धारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है] के उपबन्ध तमिलनाडू राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

“तमिलनाडू के जिला कन्याकुमारी में करुंगल क्षेत्र के विलवनकोड तालुक के राजस्व ग्राम-पालूर, कीष् मिडालम, किल्लियूर, कीष्कुलम, मिडालम, पेयन्कुलम तथा कलकुलम तालुक में कोलोचल, कप्पियारै आदि क्षेत्रों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले राजस्व गाँव”

[संख्या एस-38013/59/2006-एस एस-1]
एस. डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th November, 2006

S.O. 4457.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 16th November, 2006 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter-V and VI [except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Tamilnadu namely :

“Revenue Villages of Paloor, Keezh Midalam, Killiyoore, Keezhkulam, Midalam, Painkulam in Vilavancode Taluk and Colochel, Kappiarai in Kalkulam Taluk of Karungal area in the District of Kanniya Kumari”.

[No. S-38013/59/2006-SS-1]
S. D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 नवम्बर, 2006

का. आ. 4458.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप धारा-(3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 16 नवम्बर, 2006 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 [धारा-76 की उप धारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है] के उपबन्ध उत्तरांचल राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

राजस्व ग्राम का नाम	राजस्व परगना	राजस्व तहसील	राजस्व जिला
1. कल्याणपुर, शिमला बहादुर, फूलबाग	रुद्रपुर	किच्छा	उद्यमसिंह नगर
2. नगरपालिका क्षेत्र रुद्रपुर के राजस्व ग्राम-रम्पुरा, जगतपुर, रुद्रपुर व लमरा एवं सिडकुल में आने वाले सभी क्षेत्र	रुद्रपुर	किच्छा	उद्यमसिंह नगर

[संख्या एस-38013/60/2006-एस एस-1]

एस. डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th November, 2006

S.O. 4458.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 16th November, 2006 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter-V and VI [except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Uttaranchal namely :

Sl. No.	Name of the Revenue Village	Revenue Pragana	Revenue Tehsil	District
1.	Kalyanpur, Shimla Bahadur Phool Bagh.	Rudrapur	Kichha	U.S. Nagar
2.	Rampura, Jagatpur, Rudrapur, and Lamra of Rudrapur Municipal Area including all area under SIDCUL.	Rudrapur	Kichha	U.S. Nagar

[No. S-38013/60/2006-SS-1]
S. D. XAVIER, Under Secy.